arXiv:1106.2561v1 [math.CA] 13 Jun 2011

Characterizations of Besov and Triebel-Lizorkin Spaces on Metric Measure Spaces

Amiran Gogatishvili, Pekka Koskela and Yuan Zhou*

Abstract On a metric measure space satisfying the doubling property, we establish several optimal characterizations of Besov and Triebel-Lizorkin spaces, including a pointwise characterization. Moreover, we discuss their (non)triviality under a Poincaré inequality.

1 Introduction

Let $(\mathcal{X},\, d)$ be a metric space and μ be a regular Borel measure on $\mathcal{X}$ such that all balls defined by d have finite and positive measures, and assume that μ satisfies a *doubling property*: there exist constants $C_1 > 1$ and $n > 0$ such that for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $r \in (0,\, \infty)$ and $\lambda \in (1,\, \infty)$,

$$\mu(B(x,\, \lambda r)) \le C_1 \lambda^n \mu(B(x,\, r)).$$

Recall the following definition of Besov spaces from [7].

Definition 1.1. Let $s \in (0, \infty)$ and $p,\, q \in (0, \infty]$. The *homogeneous Besov space* $\dot{B}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ is defined to be the *collection of all* $u \in L^p_{\rm loc}(\mathcal{X})$ such that

$$\|u\|_{\dot{B}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})} \equiv \left(\int_0^\infty \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} ⨍_{B(x,\,t)} |u(x) - u(y)|^p \, d\mu(y) d\mu(x)\right)^{q/p} \frac{dt}{t^{1+sq}}\right)^{1/q} < \infty$$

with the usual modification made when $p = \infty$ or $q = \infty$.

Above, $u \in L^p_{\rm loc}(\mathcal{X})$ requires that $u \in L^p(B)$ for each ball B.

Observe that functions in $\dot{B}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ have the smoothness of order s as measured by

$$t^{-s}\left(⨍_{B(x,\,t)} |u(x) - u(y)|^p \, d\mu(y)\right)^{1/p}.$$

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification:* 42B35

Key words and phases: Besov space, Triebel-Lizorkin space, Hajłasz-Besov space, Hajłasz-Triebel-Lizorkin space, metric measure space, sharp maximal function

Pekka Koskela and Yuan Zhou were supported by the Academy of Finland grants 120972, 131477.

Amiran Gogatishvili was partially supported by the grant no. 201/08/0383 of the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic, by the Institutional Research Plan no. AV0Z10190503 of AS CR.

[*] Corresponding author.

Recall that, in the literature, there are several ways to measure the smoothness of functions. For example, letting $s \in [0, \infty)$, $\epsilon \in [0, s]$ and $\sigma \in (0, \infty)$, for all measurable functions u, set

$$C_t^{s,\sigma}(u)(x) \equiv t^{-s}\left(\fint_{B(x,t)} |u(x)-u(y)|^\sigma \, d\mu(y)\right)^{1/\sigma},$$

$$A_t^{s,\sigma}(u)(x) \equiv t^{-s}\left(\fint_{B(x,t)} |u(y)-u_{B(x,t)}|^\sigma \, d\mu(y)\right)^{1/\sigma},$$

$$I_t^{s,\sigma}(u)(x) \equiv t^{-s}\left(\inf_{c\in\mathbb{R}}\fint_{B(x,t)} |u(y)-c|^\sigma \, d\mu(y)\right)^{1/\sigma},$$

$$S_t^{s,\epsilon,\sigma}(u)(x) \equiv t^{(\epsilon-s)}\sup_{r\in(0,t]} r^{-\epsilon}\left(\inf_{c\in\mathbb{R}}\fint_{B(x,r)} |u(y)-c|^\sigma \, d\mu(y)\right)^{1/\sigma}$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$.

The first purpose of this paper is to show that the smoothness of functions in Besov spaces can be measured by the above quantatives with optimal parameters. To this end, we introduce the following spaces of Besov type. In what follows, for our convenience, we denote by $\vec{C}^{s,\sigma}$ the operator that maps each $u \in L^\sigma_{\rm loc}(\mathcal{X})$ into a measurable function $\vec{C}^{s,\sigma}(u)$ on $\mathcal{X}\times(0,\infty)$ defined by $\vec{C}^{s,\sigma}(u)(x,t) \equiv C_t^{s,\sigma}(u)(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $t \in (0,\infty)$. We define $\vec{A}^{s,\sigma}$, $\vec{I}^{s,\sigma}$ and $\vec{S}^{s,\epsilon,\sigma}$ analogously.

Definition 1.2. Let $s, \sigma \in (0, \infty)$, $\epsilon \in [0, s]$ and $p, q \in (0,\infty]$. For $\vec{E} = \vec{C}^{s,\sigma}, \vec{A}^{s,\sigma}, \vec{I}^{s,\sigma}$ or $\vec{S}^{s,\epsilon,\sigma}$, the *homogeneous space* $\vec{E}\dot{B}_{p,q}(\mathcal{X})$ *of Besov type* is defined to be the *collection of all* $u \in L^\sigma_{\rm loc}(\mathcal{X})$ such that

$$\|u\|_{\vec{E}\dot{B}_{p,q}(\mathcal{X})} \equiv \left(\int_0^\infty \|\vec{E}(u)(\cdot,t)\|^q_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}\frac{dt}{t}\right)^{1/q} < \infty$$

with the usual modification made when $p = \infty$ or $q = \infty$.

The main results of this paper read as follows. For our convenience, for $s \in (0, \infty)$ and $p \in (0, \infty]$, we always set

$$p_*(s) \equiv \begin{cases} np/(n-ps), & if \quad p < n/s; \\ \infty, & if \quad p \ge n/s. \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

Theorem 1.1. *Let $s \in (0,\infty)$ and $p, q \in (0,\infty]$.*

(i) If $\sigma \in (0, p]$, then $\dot{B}^s_{p,q}(\mathcal{X}) = \vec{C}^{s,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,q}(\mathcal{X})$.

(ii) If $\sigma \in (0, p_*(s))$, then $\dot{B}^s_{p,q}(\mathcal{X}) = \vec{I}^{s,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,q}(\mathcal{X})$.

(iii) If $\epsilon \in [0,s)$ and $\sigma \in (0, p_*(s))$, then $\dot{B}^s_{p,q}(\mathcal{X}) = \vec{S}^{s,\epsilon,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,q}(\mathcal{X})$.

(iv) If $p \in (n/(n+s), \infty]$ and $\sigma \in (0, p_*(s))$, then $\dot{B}^s_{p,q}(\mathcal{X}) = \vec{A}^{s,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,q}(\mathcal{X})$.

Moreover, the ranges of ϵ and σ above are optimal in the following sense.

(v) Let $s \in (0, 1)$*,* $p \in (0, n/s)$ *and* $\sigma > p_*(s)$*. Then there exists a function* u *such that for all* $q \in (0, \infty]$*,* $u \in \dot{B}^s_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *but* $u \notin L^\sigma_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$*, and hence, for* $\vec{E} = \vec{A}^{s,\sigma}$*,* $\vec{I}^{s,\sigma}$ *or* $\vec{S}^{s,\epsilon,\sigma}$*,* $u \notin \vec{E}\dot{B}_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$*.*

(vi) Let $p \in (0, \infty)$*,* $\sigma \in (p, \infty)$ *and* $s \in (0, n/p - n/\sigma) \cap (0, 1)$*. Then there exists a function* u *such that for all* $q \in (0, \infty]$*,* $u \in \dot{B}^s_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *but* $u \notin \vec{C}^{s,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$*.*

(vii) Let $s \in (0, 1)$ *and* $p \in (0, \infty)$*. Then there exists a function* $u \in \dot{B}^s_{p,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *with* $u \notin \vec{S}^{s,s,p}\dot{B}_{p,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$*.*

We point out that it is natural and necessary to consider the full range of s due to the nontrivial example of nontrivial Besov spaces $\dot{B}^s_{n/s,n/s}(\mathcal{X})$ for all $s \in (0, \infty)$ given by Theorem 4.3.

Recently, a fractional pointwise gradient was introduced in [19] to measure the smoothness of functions.

Definition 1.3. Let $s \in (0, \infty)$ and let u be a measurable function on $\mathcal{X}$. A sequence of nonnegative measurable functions, $\vec{g} \equiv \{g_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$, is called a *fractional s-Hajłasz gradient* of u if there exists $E \subset \mathcal{X}$ with $\mu(E) = 0$ such that for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x, y \in \mathcal{X}\setminus E$ satisfying $2^{-k-1} \le d(x, y) < 2^{-k}$,

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \le [d(x, y)]^s [g_k(x) + g_k(y)].$$

Denote by $\mathbb{D}^s(u)$ the *collection of all fractional s-Hajłasz gradients of u.*

In fact, $\vec{g} \equiv \{g_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ above is not really a gradient. One should view it, in the Euclidean setting (at least when $g_k = g_j$ for all k, j), as a maximal function of the usual gradient.

Our second result characterizes the Besov spaces in Definition 1.1 via the fractional Hajłasz gradient. In what follows, for $p, q \in (0, \infty]$ and a sequence $\vec{g} = \{g_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ of nonnegative functions, we always write $\|\{g_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_{\ell^q} \equiv \{\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} |g_j|^q\}^{1/q}$ when $q < \infty$ and $\|\{g_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_{\ell^\infty} \equiv \sup_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} |g_j|$, $\|\{g_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_{\ell^q(L^p(\mathcal{X}))} \equiv \|\{\|g_j\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_{\ell^q}$.

Definition 1.4. Let $s \in (0,\infty)$ and $p, q \in (0, \infty]$. The *homogeneous Hajłasz-Besov space* $\dot{N}^s_{p,q}(\mathcal{X})$ is the *space of all measurable functions* u such that

$$\|u\|_{\dot{N}^s_{p,q}(\mathcal{X})} \equiv \inf_{\vec{g}\in\mathbb{D}^s(u)} \|\vec{g}\|_{\ell^q(L^p(\mathcal{X}))} < \infty.$$

Theorem 1.2. *Let* $s \in (0,\infty)$ *and* $p, q \in (0,\infty]$*. Then* $\dot{N}^s_{p,q}(\mathcal{X}) = \dot{B}^s_{p,q}(\mathcal{X})$*.*

Under the additional assumptions that μ also satisfies a reverse doubling condition, $0 < s < 1$ and $p > n/(n + 1)$, $\dot{B}^s_{p,q}(\mathcal{X})$ also allows for a kernel function characterization [21].

Theorem 1.2 and (i) through (iv) of Theorem 1.1 follow from Theorem 2.1 below, whose proof relies on an inequality of Poincaré type established in Lemma 2.1 and a pointwise inequality given by Lemma 2.3. The proof of (v) through (vii) of Theorem 1.1 will be given at the end of Section 2.

Moreover, in Section 3, we state the corresponding results for Triebel-Lizorkin spaces (see Theorem 3.1). As a special case, we also establish the equivalence between Hajłasz-Sobolev spaces and the Sobolev type spaces of Calderón and DeVore-Sharpley (see Corollary 3.1).

In Section 4, applying the above characterizations, we prove the triviality of Besov and Triebel-Lizorkin spaces under a suitable Poincaré inequality (see Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2), and also give some examples of nontrivial Besov and Triebel-Lizorkin spaces to show the "necessity" of such a Poincaré inequality (see Theorem 4.3).

Finally, we make some conventions. Throughout the paper, we denote by C a *positive constant* which is independent of the main parameters, but which may vary from line to line. Constants with subscripts, such as C_0, do not change in different occurrences. The *notation* $A \lesssim B$ or $B \gtrsim A$ means that $A \le CB$. If $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$, we then write $A \sim B$. For two spaces X and Y endowed with (semi-)norms, the notation $X \subset Y$ means that $u \in X$ implies that $u \in Y$ and $\|u\|_Y \lesssim \|u\|_X$, and the notation $X = Y$ means that $X \subset Y$ and $Y \subset X$. Denote by $\mathbb{Z}$ the *set of integers* and $\mathbb{N}$ the *set of positive integers*. For any locally integrable function f, we denote by $⨍_E f\,d\mu$ the *average of f on E*, namely, $⨍_E f\,d\mu \equiv \frac{1}{\mu(E)}\int_E f\,d\mu$.

2 Proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2

We begin with a Poincaré type inequality.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $s \in (0, \infty)$ and $p \in (0, n/s)$. Then for every pair of $\epsilon, \epsilon' \in (0, s)$ with $\epsilon < \epsilon'$, there exists a positive constant C such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, measurable functions u and $\vec{g} \in \mathbb{D}^s(u)$,*

$$\inf_{c\in\mathbb{R}} \left(⨍_{B(x,\,2^{-k})} |u(y) - c|^{p_*(\epsilon)}\,d\mu(y) \right)^{1/p_*(\epsilon)}$$
$$\le C 2^{-k\epsilon'} \sum_{j\ge k-2} 2^{-j(s-\epsilon')} \left\{ ⨍_{B(x,\,2^{-k+1})} [g_j(y)]^p\,d\mu(y) \right\}^{1/p},$$

where $p_*(\epsilon)$ is as in (1.1).

Recall that when $s \in (0, 1]$ and $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^n$, Lemma 2.1 was established in [19, Lemma 2.3]. Generally, Lemma 2.1 can be proved by an argument similar to that of [19, Lemma 2.3] with the aid of the following variant of [13, Theorem 8.7]. In what follows, for every $s \in (0, \infty)$ and measurable function u on $\mathcal{X}$, a non-negative function g is called an *s-gradient* of u if there exists a set $E \subset \mathcal{X}$ with $\mu(E) = 0$ such that for all $x,\ y \in \mathcal{X} \setminus E$,

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \le [d(x, y)]^s [g(x) + g(y)]. \tag{2.1}$$

Denote by $\mathcal{D}^s(u)$ the *collection of all s-gradients of u.*

Lemma 2.2. *Let $s \in (0, \infty)$, $p \in (0, n/s)$ and let $p_*(s)$ be as in (1.1). Then there exists a positive constant C such that for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $r \in (0, \infty)$, and all measurable functions u and $g \in \mathcal{D}^s(u)$,*

$$\inf_{c\in\mathbb{R}} \left(\fint_{B(x,r)} |u(y) - c|^{p_*(s)}\, d\mu(y) \right)^{1/p_*(s)} \le Cr^s \left(\fint_{B(x,2r)} [g(y)]^p\, d\mu(y) \right)^{1/p}.$$

When $s \in (0, 1]$, since d^s is also a distance on $\mathcal{X}$, Lemma 2.2 follows from [13, Theorem 8.7]. When $s \in (1, \infty)$, with $p < n/s$ in mind, checking the proof of [13, Theorem 8.7] line by line, we still have Lemma 2.2. We omit the details.

We still need the following pointwise inequality, which is a variant of the pointwise inequality established in [19, (5.7)].

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\sigma \in (0, \infty)$. Then there exists a positive constant C such that, for each function $u \in L^\sigma_{\rm loc}(\mathcal{X})$, one can find a set E with $\mu(E) = 0$ so that for each pair of points $x, y \in \mathcal{X} \setminus E$ with $d(x, y) \in [2^{-k-1}, 2^{-k})$,*

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \le C \sum_{j\ge k-2} \left\{ \inf_{c\in\mathbb{R}} \left[\fint_{B(x,2^{-j})} |u(w) - c|^\sigma\, dw \right]^{1/\sigma} + \inf_{c\in\mathbb{R}} \left[\fint_{B(y,2^{-j})} |u(w) - c|^\sigma\, dw \right]^{1/\sigma} \right\}. \tag{2.2}$$

To prove Lemma 2.3, we need Lemma 2.4 below. In what follows, for a real-valued measurable function u and a ball B, define the *median value* of u on B by

$$m_u(B) \equiv \max\left\{ a \in \mathbb{R},\ \mu(\{x \in B:\ u(x) < a\}) \le \frac{\mu(B)}{2} \right\}. \tag{2.3}$$

Lemma 2.4. *For every real-valued measurable function u, there exists a measurable set $E \subset \mathcal{X}$ with $\mu(E) = 0$ such that for all $z \in \mathcal{X} \setminus E$,*

$$u(z) = \lim_{\mu(B)\to 0,\, B\ni z} m_u(B).$$

Lemma 2.4 was proved in [5, Lemma 2.2] for $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^n$, and the very same argument gives Lemma 2.4. We omit the details.

Proof of Lemma 2.3. Let u be a real-valued measurable function and E be the set given by Lemma 2.4. Then for all $z \in \mathcal{X} \setminus E$, by Lemma 2.4, $m_u(B(z, 2^{-j})) \to u(z)$ as $j \to \infty$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|u(z) - m_u(B(z, 2^{-k}))\right| \\ &\quad\le \sum_{j\ge k} \left|m_u(B(z, 2^{-j})) - m_u(B(z, 2^{-j-1}))\right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \sum_{j\geq k}\left[\left|m_u(B(z,\,2^{-j}))-c_{B(z,\,2^{-j})}\right|+\left|m_u(B(z,\,2^{-j-1}))-c_{B(z,\,2^{-j})}\right|\right],$$

where $c_{B(z,\,2^{-j})}$ is a real number such that

$$\fint_{B(z,\,2^{-j})}\left|u(w)-c_{B(z,\,2^{-j})}\right|^{\sigma}\,d\mu(w)\leq 2\inf_{c\in\mathbb{R}}\fint_{B(z,\,2^{-j})}|u(w)-c|^{\sigma}\,d\mu(w).$$

We claim that for every ball B and each $c\in\mathbb{R}$,

$$|m_u(B)-c|\leq\left\{2\fint_B|u(w)-c|^{\sigma}\,d\mu(w)\right\}^{1/\sigma}. \tag{2.4}$$

Assume that this claim holds for a moment. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|m_u(B(z,\,2^{-j}))-c_{B(z,\,2^{-j})}\right| &\leq\left\{2\fint_{B(z,\,2^{-j})}|u(w)-c_{B(z,\,2^{-j})}|^{\sigma}\,d\mu(w)\right\}^{1/\sigma}\\ &\lesssim\inf_{c\in\mathbb{R}}\left\{\fint_{B(z,\,2^{-j})}|u(w)-c|^{\sigma}\,d\mu(w)\right\}^{1/\sigma}\end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\left|m_u(B(z,\,2^{-j-1}))-c_{B(z,\,2^{-j})}\right| &\leq\left\{2\fint_{B(z,\,2^{-j-1})}|u(w)-c_{B(z,\,2^{-j})}|^{\sigma}\,dw\right\}^{1/\sigma}\\ &\lesssim\left\{\fint_{B(z,\,2^{-j})}|u(w)-c_{B(z,\,2^{-j})}|^{\sigma}\,dw\right\}^{1/\sigma}\\ &\lesssim\inf_{c\in\mathbb{R}}\left\{\fint_{B(z,\,2^{-j})}|u(w)-c|^{\sigma}\,dw\right\}^{1/\sigma}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Therefore,

$$\left|u(z)-m_u(B(z,\,2^{-k}))\right|\lesssim\sum_{j\geq k}\inf_{c\in\mathbb{R}}\left\{\fint_{B(z,\,r_j)}|u(w)-c|^{\sigma}\,dw\right\}^{1/\sigma}. \tag{2.7}$$

For $x,\,y\in\mathcal{X}\setminus E$ with $2^{-k-1}\leq d(x,\,y)<2^{-k}$, we write

$$\begin{aligned}|u(x)-u(y)|\leq{}&|u(x)-m_u(B(x,\,2^{-k+1}))|+|m_u(B(x,\,2^{-k+1}))-c_{B(x,\,2^{-k+1})}|\\ &+|c_{B(x,\,2^{-k+1})}-m_u(B(y,\,2^{-k}))|+|u(y)-m_u(B(y,\,2^{-k}))|.\end{aligned}$$

By an argument similar to that of (2.6), we have

$$|c_{B(x,\,2^{-k+1})}-m_u(B(y,\,2^{-k}))|\lesssim\inf_{c\in\mathbb{R}}\left\{\fint_{B(x,\,2^{-k+1})}|u(w)-c|^{\sigma}\,dw\right\}^{1/\sigma},$$

which together with (2.7) and (2.5) gives (2.2).

Now we prove the claim (2.4). For every ball B and each $c \in \mathbb{R}$, observing that $m_{u-c}(B) = m_u(B) - c$ and recalling that $|m_u(B)| \le m_{|u|}(B)$ as proved in [5, Lemma 2.1], we have $|m_u(B) - c| \le m_{|u-c|}(B)$. By this, (2.4) is reduced to

$$m_{|u-c|}(B) \le \left\{ 2 ⨍_B |u(w) - c|^\sigma \, d\mu(w) \right\}^{1/\sigma}. \tag{2.8}$$

To see this, letting $\delta \equiv ⨍_B |u(w) - c|^\sigma \, dw$, by Chebyshev's inequality, for every $a > 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu\left(\left\{w \in B:\ |u(w) - c| \ge (a\delta)^{1/\sigma}\right\}\right) &= \mu\left(\{w \in B:\ |u(w) - c|^\sigma \ge a\delta\}\right) \\ &\le (a\delta)^{-1} \int_B |u(w) - c|^\sigma \, dw < \frac{\mu(B)}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields that

$$\mu\left(\left\{w \in B:\ |u(w) - c| < (a\delta)^{1/\sigma}\right\}\right) > \frac{\mu(B)}{2}$$

and hence by (2.3), $m_{|u-c|}(B) \le (a\delta)^{1/\sigma}$. Then letting $a \to 2$, we obtain (2.8) and hence prove the claim (2.4). This finishes the proof of Lemma 2.3. □

We also use the following lemma.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $s, \sigma \in (0, \infty)$, $\epsilon \in [0, s]$ and $p, q \in (0, \infty]$. Let $\vec{E} = \vec{C}^{s,\sigma}, \vec{A}^{s,\sigma}, \vec{I}^{s,\sigma}$ or $\vec{S}^{s,\epsilon,\sigma}$. Then for each measurable function u,*

$$\|u\|_{\vec{E}\dot{B}_{p,q}(\mathcal{X})} \sim \left\| \left\{ \vec{E}(u)(x, 2^{-k}) \right\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \right\|_{\ell^q(L^p(\mathcal{X}))}. \tag{2.9}$$

Proof. Observe that $\vec{E}(u)(x, t) \lesssim \vec{E}(u)(x, 2^{-k+1})$ for all $t \in (2^{-k}, 2^{-k+1}]$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, from which (2.9) follows by a simple computation. This finishes the proof of Lemma 2.5. □

With the aid of Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 2.5, we obtain the following result, which, together with the fact $\vec{C}^{s,p}\dot{B}_{p,q}(\mathcal{X}) = \dot{B}^s_{p,q}(\mathcal{X})$, implies Theorem 1.2 and (i) through (iv) of Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $s \in (0, \infty)$ and $p, q \in (0, \infty]$.*

(i) If $\sigma \in (0, p]$, then $\dot{N}^s_{p,q}(\mathcal{X}) = \vec{C}^{s,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,q}(\mathcal{X})$.

(ii) If $\sigma \in (0, p_*(s))$, then $\dot{N}^s_{p,q}(\mathcal{X}) = \vec{I}^{s,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,q}(\mathcal{X})$.

(iii) If $\epsilon \in [0, s)$ and $\sigma \in (0, p_*(s))$, then $\dot{N}^s_{p,q}(\mathcal{X}) = \vec{S}^{s,\epsilon,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,q}(\mathcal{X})$.

(iv) If $p \in (n/(n+s), \infty]$ and $\sigma \in (0, p_*(s))$, then $\dot{N}^s_{p,q}(\mathcal{X}) = \vec{A}^{s,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,q}(\mathcal{X})$.

Proof. First, notice that if $\mu(\mathcal{X}) < \infty$, then

$$\operatorname{diam} \mathcal{X} \equiv \sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{X}} d(x, y) < \infty. \tag{2.10}$$

Indeed, suppose that $\operatorname{diam}\mathcal{X}=\infty$. Fix a ball $B(x_0,\,r_0)\subset\mathcal{X}$. By our assumptions on μ, we have $\mu(B(x_0,\,r_0))>0$. Notice that for any $x_1\in\mathcal{X}$ with $d(x_1,\,x_0)\ge 2r_0$, by the doubling property and $B(x_0,\,r_0)\subset B(x_1,\,2d(x_1,\,x_0))$, we have

$$\mu(B(x_1,\,\frac{1}{2}d(x_1,\,x_0)))\ge (C_1)^{-1}4^{-n}\mu(B(x_1,\,2d(x_1,\,x_0)))\ge (C_1)^{-1}4^{-n}\mu(B(x_0,\,r_0)).$$

Let $r_1=2d(x_1,\,x_0)$. Since $B(x_1,\,\frac{1}{2}d(x_1,\,x_0))\cap B(x_0,\,r_0)=\emptyset$, we have

$$\mu(\mathcal{X})>\mu(B(x_1,\,r_1))\ge[1+(C_1)^{-1}4^{-n}]\mu(B(x_0,\,r_0)).$$

Repeating this procedure for N times, we can find $x_N\in\mathcal{X}$ and $r_N>0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(\mathcal{X})>\mu(B(x_N,\,r_N))&\ge[1+(C_1)^{-1}4^{-n}]\mu(B(x_{N-1},\,r_{N-1}))\\&\ge\cdots\ge[1+(C_1)^{-1}4^{-n}]^N\mu(B(x_0,\,r_0)),\end{aligned}$$

which tends to infinity as $N\to\infty$. This is a contradiction. Thus $\operatorname{diam}\mathcal{X}<\infty$.

Assume that $2^{-k_0-1}\le\operatorname{diam}\mathcal{X}<2^{-k_0}$ for some $k_0\in\mathbb{Z}$. Observe that

$$\|u\|_{\vec{E}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})}\sim\left(\sum_{k\ge k_0-2}\left\|\vec{E}(u)(\cdot,\,2^{-k})\right\|^q_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}\right)^{1/q}$$

and that for any $\vec{g}\in\mathbb{D}^s(u)$, we can always take $g_k\equiv 0$ for $k<k_0-2$. Because of this, the proof of Theorem 1.2 for the case $\mu(\mathcal{X})<\infty$ is a slight modification of that for the case $\mu(\mathcal{X})=\infty$ below. In what follows, we only consider the case $\mu(\mathcal{X})=\infty$.

We first prove (ii) and (iii). Observing that

$$I_t^{s,\,\sigma}(u)(x)\le S_t^{s,\,\epsilon,\,\sigma}(u)(x) \tag{2.11}$$

for all $t\in(0,\,\infty)$ and $x\in\mathcal{X}$, we have $\vec{S}^{s,\,\epsilon,\,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})\subset\vec{I}^{s,\,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$. So it suffices to prove that $\vec{I}^{s,\,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})\subset\dot{N}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})\subset\vec{S}^{s,\,\epsilon,\,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$.

To prove $\vec{I}^{s,\,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})\subset\dot{N}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$, let $u\in\vec{I}^{s,\,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ and E with $\mu(E)=0$ be as in Lemma 2.3. By Lemma 2.3, it is easy to see that for $x,\,y\in\mathbb{R}^n\setminus E$ and $d(x,\,y)\in[2^{-k-1},2^{-k})$,

$$|u(x)-u(y)|\le C[d(x,\,y)]^s\sum_{j\ge k-2}2^{(k-j)s}[I^{s,\,\sigma}_{2^{-j}}(u)(x)+I^{s,\,\sigma}_{2^{-j}}(u)(y)]. \tag{2.12}$$

For $k\in\mathbb{Z}$, set

$$g_k\equiv\sum_{j\ge k-2}2^{(k-j)s}I^{s,\,\sigma}_{2^{-j}}(u). \tag{2.13}$$

Then $\vec{g}\equiv\{g_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\in\mathbb{D}^s(u)$ modulo a fixed constant and it is easy to check that

$$\|\vec{g}\|_{\ell^q(L^p(\mathcal{X}))}\lesssim\|\{I^{s,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u)\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_{\ell^q(L^p(\mathcal{X}))};$$

see the proof of [19, Theorem 2.1] for details. So, by Lemma 2.5, $u \in \dot N^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ and

$$\|u\|_{\dot N^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})} \le \|\vec g\|_{\ell^q(L^p(\mathcal{X}))} \lesssim \|\{I^{s,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u)\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_{\ell^q(L^p(\mathcal{X}))} \sim \|u\|_{\vec I^{s,\,\sigma}\dot B_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})}. \tag{2.14}$$

This leads to $\vec I^{s,\,\sigma}\dot B_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \dot N^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$.

To prove that $\dot N^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \vec S^{s,\,\epsilon,\,\sigma}\dot B_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$, since $\sigma < p_*(s)$, we can choose $\epsilon' \in (0,\,s)$ and $\delta \in (0,\,p)$ such that $\sigma \le \delta_*(\epsilon') = n\delta/(n-\epsilon'\delta)$. We also let $\epsilon'' \in (\epsilon',\,s)$ and $\epsilon''' \in (0,\,\min\{s-\epsilon'',\,s-\epsilon\})$. For given $u \in \dot N^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$, take $\vec g \in \mathbb{D}^s(u)$ with $\|\vec g\|_{\ell^q(L^p(\mathcal{X}))} \le 2\|u\|_{\dot N^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})}$. Set

$$h_k \equiv 2^{k\epsilon'''}\sum_{i\ge k} 2^{-i\epsilon'''} g_i$$

for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $\vec h \equiv \{h_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}^s(u)$, $h_i \le 2^{(i-k)\epsilon'''}h_k$ for any $i \ge k$, and moreover, it is easy to check

$$\|\vec h\|_{\ell^q(L^p(\mathcal{X}))} \lesssim \|\vec g\|_{\ell^q(L^p(\mathcal{X}))} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot N^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})}; \tag{2.15}$$

see the proof of [19, Theorem 2.1] for details. Then by Lemma 2.1, for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $j \ge k$,

$$\begin{aligned} I^{\epsilon,\,\sigma}_{2^{-j}}(u)(x) &= 2^{j\epsilon}\left(\inf_{c\in\mathbb{R}} \fint_{B(x,\,2^{-j})} |u(z)-c|^{\sigma}\,d\mu(z)\right)^{1/\sigma} \\ &\le 2^{j\epsilon}\left(\inf_{c\in\mathbb{R}} \fint_{B(x,\,2^{-j})} |u(z)-c|^{n\delta/(n-\epsilon'\delta)}\,d\mu(z)\right)^{(n-\epsilon'\delta)/n\delta} \\ &\lesssim 2^{j\epsilon}2^{-j\epsilon''}\sum_{i\ge j-2} 2^{-i(s-\epsilon'')}\left(\fint_{B(x,\,2^{-j+1})} [h_i(z)]^{\delta}\,d\mu(z)\right)^{1/\delta} \\ &\lesssim 2^{j(\epsilon-s)}\sum_{i\ge j-2} 2^{(j-i)(s-\epsilon'')}\left(\fint_{B(x,\,2^{-j+1})} [h_i(z)]^{\delta}\,d\mu(z)\right)^{1/\delta} \\ &\lesssim 2^{j(\epsilon-s)}\sum_{i\ge j-2} 2^{(j-i)(s-\epsilon'')}\mathcal{M}_\delta(h_i)(x) \\ &\lesssim 2^{j(\epsilon-s)}\sum_{i\ge j-2} 2^{(j-i)(s-\epsilon'')}2^{(i-k)\epsilon'''}\mathcal{M}_\delta(h_k)(x) \\ &\lesssim 2^{j(\epsilon-s)}2^{(j-k)\epsilon'''}\mathcal{M}_\delta(h_k)(x). \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

Here and in what follows $\mathcal{M}$ denotes the *Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator* and $\mathcal{M}_\delta(u) \equiv [\mathcal{M}(|u|^\delta)]^{1/\delta}$ for all $u \in L^\delta_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\delta \in (0,\,\infty)$. Thus for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned} S^{s,\,\epsilon,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u)(x) &\lesssim 2^{k(s-\epsilon)}\sup_{j\ge k} 2^{j(\epsilon-s)}I^{\epsilon,\,\sigma}_{2^{-j}}(u)(x) \\ &\lesssim \sup_{j\ge k} 2^{-(j-k)(s-\epsilon)}2^{(j-k)\epsilon'''}\mathcal{M}_\delta(h_k)(x) \lesssim \mathcal{M}_\delta(h_k)(x). \end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

So, by the $L^{p/\delta}(\mathcal{X})$-boundedness of $\mathcal{M}$, Lemma 2.5 and (2.15), we have $u \in \vec{S}^{s,\,\epsilon,\,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\|u\|_{\vec{S}^{s,\,\epsilon,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})} &\lesssim \|\{S^{s,\,\epsilon,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u)\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_{\ell^q(L^p(\mathcal{X}))}\\ &\lesssim \|\{\mathcal{M}_\delta(h_k)\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_{\ell^q(L^p(\mathcal{X}))} \lesssim \|\vec{h}\|_{\ell^q(L^p(\mathcal{X}))} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{N}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})}.\end{aligned}$$

This yields $\dot{N}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \vec{S}^{s,\,\epsilon,\,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ and thus finishes the proofs of (ii) and (iii).

Now we prove (i). Since

$$I^{s,\,\sigma}_t(u)(x) \le C^{s,\,\sigma}_t(u)(x) \tag{2.18}$$

for all $t \in (0,\,\infty)$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we have $\vec{C}^{s,\,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \vec{I}^{s,\,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$, and hence by (ii), $\vec{C}^{s,\,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{N}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$. So we only need to show that $\dot{N}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \vec{C}^{s,\,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$. For given $u \in \dot{N}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$, take $\vec{g} \in \mathbb{D}^s(u)$ with $\|\vec{g}\|_{\ell^q(L^p(\mathcal{X}))} \le 2\|u\|_{\dot{N}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})}$. Then by Lemma 2.1, for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned}C^{s,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u)(x) &= 2^{ks}\left(\sum_{j\ge k}\frac{1}{\mu(B(x,\,2^{-k}))}\int_{B(x,\,2^{-j})\setminus B(x,\,2^{-j-1})}|u(z)-u(x)|^\sigma\,d\mu(z)\right)^{1/\sigma}\\ &\le 2^{ks}\left(\sum_{j\ge k-2}2^{-js\sigma}\fint_{B(x,\,2^{-j})}\left([g_j(z)]^\sigma+[g_j(x)]^\sigma\right)\,d\mu(z)\right)^{1/\sigma}\\ &= \left(\sum_{j\ge k}2^{-(j-k)s\delta}[g_j(x)]^\sigma+\sum_{j\ge k}2^{-(j-k)s\sigma}\fint_{B(x,\,2^{-j})}[g_j(z)]^\sigma\,d\mu(z)\right)^{1/\sigma}.\end{aligned}$$

If $p > \sigma$, then when $\sigma \in (0,\,1)$, applying the Hölder inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}C^{s,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u)(x) &\lesssim \left(\sum_{j\ge k}2^{-(j-k)s\sigma}[\mathcal{M}_\sigma(g_j)(x)]^\sigma\right)^{1/\sigma}\\ &\lesssim \sum_{j\ge k}2^{-(j-k)s/2}\mathcal{M}_\sigma(g_j)(x)\left(\sum_{j\ge k}2^{-(j-k)s\sigma/2(1-\sigma)}\right)^{(1-\sigma)/\sigma}\\ &\lesssim \sum_{j\ge k}2^{-(j-k)s/2}\mathcal{M}_\sigma(g_j)(x),\end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

and when $\sigma \in [1,\,p)$, by $1/\sigma \le 1$,

$$C^{s,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u)(x) \lesssim \sum_{j\ge k}2^{-(j-k)s}\mathcal{M}_\sigma(g_j)(x).$$

From this, it is easy to deduce that

$$\|\{C^{s,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u)\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_{\ell^q(L^p(\mathcal{X}))} \lesssim \|\{\mathcal{M}_\sigma(g_k)\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_{\ell^q(L^p(\mathcal{X}))}.$$

By this, the $L^{p/\sigma}(\mathcal{X})$-boundedness of $\mathcal{M}$ and Lemma 2.5, we have $u \in \vec{C}^{s,\,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ and

$$\|u\|_{\vec{C}^{s,\,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|\{C^{s,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u)\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_{\ell^q(L^p(\mathcal{X}))} \lesssim \|\vec{g}\|_{\ell^q(L^p(\mathcal{X}))} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{N}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})}.$$

If $\sigma = p$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{\vec{C}^{s,\,p}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})} &\lesssim \left\{\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}}\sum_{j\ge k}2^{-(j-k)sp}[g_j(x)]^p\,d\mu(x)\right)^{q/p}\right\}^{1/q} \\
&\quad + \left\{\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}}\sum_{j\ge k}2^{-(j-k)sp}\fint_{B(x,\,2^{-j})}[g_j(z)]^p\,d\mu(z)\,d\mu(x)\right)^{q/p}\right\}^{1/q} \\
&\lesssim \left\{\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}}\sum_{j\ge k}2^{-(j-k)sp}[g_j(x)]^p\,d\mu(x)\right)^{q/p}\right\}^{1/q} \\
&\lesssim \|\vec{g}\|_{\ell^q(L^p(\mathcal{X}))} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{N}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})}.
\end{aligned}$$

This gives $\dot{N}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \vec{C}^{s,\,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ and thus finishes the proof of (i).

Finally, we prove (iv). Trivially,

$$I^{s,\,\sigma}_t(u)(x) \le A^{s,\,\sigma}_t(u)(x) \tag{2.20}$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $t \in (0,\,\infty)$, which implies that $\vec{A}^{s,\,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \vec{I}^{s,\,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$. On the other hand, since $p > n/(n+s)$ and $\sigma < p_*(s)$, we can find $\sigma' \in (\max\{\sigma,\,1\},\,p_*(s))$. Notice that, for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$, by the Minkowski inequality and the Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\fint_{B(x,\,t)}|u-u_{B(x,\,t)}|^{\sigma'}\,d\mu(z)\right)^{1/\sigma'} &\le \left(\fint_{B(x,\,t)}|u-c|^{\sigma'}\,d\mu(z)\right)^{1/\sigma'} + |c-u_{B(x,\,t)}| \\
&\le 2\left(\fint_{B(x,\,t)}|u-c|^{\sigma'}\,d\mu(z)\right)^{1/\sigma'},
\end{aligned}$$

which together with the Hölder inequality again implies that

$$A^{s,\,\sigma}_t(u)(x) \le A^{s,\,\sigma'}_t(u)(x) \le 2I^{s,\,\sigma'}_t(u)(x) \tag{2.21}$$

for all $u \in L^{\sigma}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathcal{X})$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $t \in (0,\,\infty)$. Then $\vec{I}^{s,\,\sigma'}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \vec{A}^{s,\,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$. Recall that we have proved that $\vec{I}^{s,\,\sigma'}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) = \dot{N}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) = \dot{B}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) = \vec{I}^{s,\,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$. So we obtain (iv). The proof of Theorem 2.1 is finished. □

Remark 2.1. For the theory of Besov spaces on $\mathbb{R}^n$ see, for example, [25, 22, 26], and, on metric measure spaces, see [9, 21, 7]. When $s \in (0,\,1)$, $p \in (n/(n+s),\,\infty]$ and $q \in (0,\,\infty]$, the equivalence $\dot{B}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) = \vec{C}^{s,\,1}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ on a metric measure space satisfying both a doubling and a reverse doubling property was established in [21] by Müller and Yang and the pointwise characterization of $\dot{B}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ in [19]. But Theorem 2.1 (hence Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2) does not require a reverse doubling property and also works for the whole index range.

One can derive the following inequality from the proof of (2.16).

Corollary 2.1. *For* $s \in (0,\,\infty)$, $\delta \in (0,\,\infty)$, $\sigma \in (0,\,\delta_*(s))$ *and* $\sigma' \in (0,\,\infty)$, *there exist* $\epsilon > 0$ *satisfying* $\sigma < \delta_*(s-\epsilon)$, *and constant* C *such that for all* $u \in L^\sigma_{\rm loc}(u)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ *and* $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$I^{s,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u)(x) \le C2^{-k\epsilon}\mathcal{M}_\delta\left(\sum_{j\ge k-2} I^{s-\epsilon,\,\sigma'}_{2^{-j}}(u)\right)(x). \tag{2.22}$$

Proof. If $\sigma' \ge \sigma$, then (2.22) is trivial or follows from the Hölder inequality. If $\sigma' < \sigma$, then we employ the argument for (2.16) with the special choice $g_j \equiv I^{s,\,\sigma'}_{2^{-j}}(u)$ for all $j \ge k-2$. We leave the details to the reader. □

We close Section 2 by proving the optimality of the ranges of ϵ and σ in Theorem 1.1.

Proofs of (v) though (vii) of Theorem 1.1. (v) For $\alpha \in (0,\,\infty)$, define

$$u_\alpha(x) \equiv |x|^{-\alpha}\chi_{B(0,\,1)}(x) + \chi_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus B(0,\,1)}(x).$$

We first claim that $u_\alpha \in \dot{B}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ when $\alpha \in (0,\,n/p-s)$. To see this, for $j \le 0$, we set

$$g_j(x) \equiv 2^{js}|x|^{-\alpha}\chi_{B(0,\,1)}(x),$$

and, for $j \ge 1$, we set

$$g_j(x) \equiv 2^{js}|x|^{-\alpha}\chi_{B(0,\,2^{-j-3})}(x) + 2^{-j(1-s)}|x|^{-\alpha-1}\chi_{B(0,\,1)\setminus B(0,\,2^{-j-3})}(x).$$

Then it is easy to check that $\vec{g} \equiv \{g_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}^s(u_\alpha)$ modulo a fixed constant. Moreover, since $p\alpha < n$, for $j \le 0$, we have that

$$\|g_j\|^p_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le \int_{B(0,\,1)} 2^{jps}|x|^{-p\alpha}\,dx \lesssim 2^{jps},$$

and for $j \ge 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|g_j\|^p_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} &\le \int_{B(0,\,2^{-j-3})} 2^{jps}|x|^{-p\alpha}\,dx\\ &\quad+ \int_{B(0,\,1)\setminus B(0,\,2^{-j-3})} 2^{-jp(1-s)}|x|^{-p(\alpha+1)}\,dx\\ &\lesssim 2^{j[p(s+\alpha)-n]} + 2^{-jp(1-s)}.\end{aligned}$$

Observing that $s+\alpha<n/p$ and recalling that $s<1$, we have $\|\vec{g}\|_{\ell^q(L^p(\mathbb{R}^n))}<\infty$, which is as desired. Now, taking $\alpha=n/\sigma$ and noticing $s+\alpha<s+n/p_*(s)=n/p$, we have $u_\alpha\in\dot{N}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and hence by Theorem 1.2, $u_\alpha\in\dot{B}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. This yields (v) since $u_\alpha\notin L^\sigma_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

(vi) Let $\alpha=n/\sigma$. Since $\alpha+s<n/p$, as shown in (v), $u_\alpha\in\dot{N}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Let us check that $\|u_\alpha\|_{\vec{C}^{s,\,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)}=\infty$. Indeed, if $1/2\le|x|\le3/4$, then $B(0,\,1/4)\subset B(x,\,1)$ and for all $z\in B(0,\,1/4)$,

$$|x|^{-\alpha}\le(1/2)^{-\alpha}=2^{-\alpha}(1/4)^{-\alpha}\le2^{-\alpha}|z|^{-\alpha},$$

which implies that $|u(x)-u(z)|\ge(1-2^{-\alpha})|z|^{-\alpha}$, and hence by $n=\alpha\sigma$,

$$⨍_{B(x,\,1)}|u(x)-u(z)|^\sigma\,dz\gtrsim⨍_{B(0,\,1/4)}|z|^{-n}\,dz=\infty.$$

Therefore

$$\|u\|_{\vec{C}^{s,\,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)}\gtrsim\left\{\int_{B(0,\,3/4)\setminus B(0,\,1/2)}\left(⨍_{B(x,\,1)}|u(x)-u(z)|^\sigma\,dz\right)^{p/\sigma}dx\right\}^{1/p}=\infty$$

as desired. This gives (vi).

(vii) Let $\alpha=n/p-s$ and $\beta\in(-2/p,\,-1/p)$, and define

$$u(x)\equiv|x|^{-\alpha}\left(\log\frac{2}{|x|}\right)^\beta\chi_{B(0,\,1)}(x)+\chi_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus B(0,\,1)}(x).$$

We claim that $u\in\dot{N}^s_{p,\,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. To see this, similarly to (v), for $j\le0$, we set

$$g_j(x)\equiv2^{js}|x|^{-\alpha}\left(\log\frac{2}{|x|}\right)^\beta\chi_{B(0,\,1)}(x),$$

and for $j\ge1$, we set

$$\begin{aligned}g_j(x)\equiv\;&2^{js}|x|^{-\alpha}\left(\log\frac{2}{|x|}\right)^\beta\chi_{B(0,\,2^{-j-3})}(x)\\&+2^{-j(1-s)}|x|^{-\alpha-1}\left(\log\frac{2}{|x|}\right)^\beta\chi_{B(0,\,1)\setminus B(0,\,2^{-j-3})}(x).\end{aligned}$$

Then $\vec{g}\equiv\{g_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\in\mathbb{D}^s(u)$ modulo a fixed constant. Since $\alpha+s=n/p$ and $p\beta<-1$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j\ge1}\|g_j\|^p_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}\lesssim&\sum_{j\ge1}\int_{B(0,\,2^{-j-3})}2^{jps}|x|^{-p\alpha}\left(\log\frac{2}{|x|}\right)^{p\beta}dx\\&+\sum_{j\ge1}\int_{B(0,\,1)\setminus B(0,\,2^{-j-3})}2^{-jp(1-s)}|x|^{-p(\alpha+1)}\left(\log\frac{2}{|x|}\right)^{p\beta}dx\\\lesssim&\int_{B(0,\,1)}|x|^{-p(\alpha+s)}\left(\log\frac{2}{|x|}\right)^{p\beta}dx\end{aligned}$$

$$\lesssim \int_0^1 \left(\log \frac{2}{t}\right)^{p\beta} \frac{dt}{t} < \infty$$

and that

$$\sum_{j\le 0} \|g_j\|^p_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \int_{B(0,\,1)} |x|^{-p(\alpha+s)} \left(\log \frac{2}{|x|}\right)^{p\beta} dx < \infty.$$

Thus $u \in \dot{N}^s_{p,\,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. On the other hand, for any $x \in B(0,\,1/2)$ and all $t > |x|$,

$$\begin{aligned} S^{s,\,s,\,p}_t(u)(x) &\ge |x|^{-s} \left(\inf_{c\in\mathbb{R}} \fint_{B(x,\,|x|)} |u(z) - c|^p\, dx\right)^{1/p} \\ &\ge (2|x|)^{-s} \left(\fint_{B(x,\,|x|)} |u(z) - u(x_0)|^p\, dx\right)^{1/p}, \end{aligned}$$

where may choose $x_0 \in B(x,\,|x|)$. Moreover, up to a rotation, we can assume that $x_0 = x|x_0|/|x|$. Observe that if $|x_0| \ge |x|$, then for $z \in B(x/2,\,|x|/4) \subset B(0,\,3|x|/4)$,

$$|u(z) - u(x_0)| \ge |u(3x/4) - u(x)| \gtrsim u(x).$$

Moreover, if $|x_0| \le |x|$, then for $z \in B(3x/2,\,|x|/4) \subset B(0,\,1) \setminus B(0,\,5|x|/4)$,

$$|u(z) - u(x_0)| \ge |u(5x/4) - u(x)| \gtrsim u(x).$$

Hence by $B(x/2,\,|x|/4) \cup B(3x/2,\,|x|/4) \subset B(x,\,|x|)$ and $\alpha + s = n/p$, we have

$$S^{s,\,s,\,p}_t(u)(x) \gtrsim |x|^{-\alpha-s} \left(\log \frac{2}{|x|}\right)^{\beta} \sim |x|^{-n/p} \left(\log \frac{2}{|x|}\right)^{\beta},$$

from which together with $p\beta + 1 > -1$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|^p_{\vec{S}^{s,\,s,\,p}\dot{B}_{p,\,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} &\gtrsim \sum_{j\ge 0} \|S^{s,\,s,\,p}_{2^{-j}}(u)\|^p_{L^p(B(0,\,2^{-j-1}))} \\ &\gtrsim \sum_{j\ge 0} \int_{B(0,\,2^{-j-1})} |x|^{-n} \left(\log \frac{2}{|x|}\right)^{p\beta} dx \\ &\sim \int_{B(0,\,1)} |x|^{-n} \left(\log \frac{2}{|x|}\right)^{p\beta+1} dx \\ &\sim \int_0^{1/2} \left(\log \frac{2}{t}\right)^{p\beta+1} \frac{dt}{t} = \infty. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Theorem 2.1 is finished. □

3 Triebel-Lizorkin spaces

In what follows, for $p,\, q \in (0,\, \infty]$ and a sequence $\vec{g}$ of measurable functions, we set $\|\vec{g}\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X},\, \ell^q)} \equiv \|\|\vec{g}\|_{\ell^q}\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}$.

Definition 3.1. Let $s \in (0, \infty)$ and $p,\, q \in (0,\, \infty]$. The *homogeneous Hajłasz-Triebel-Lizorkin space* $\dot{M}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ is the *space of all measurable functions* u such that $\|u\|_{\dot{M}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})} < \infty$, where when $p \in (0,\, \infty)$ or $p,\, q = \infty$,

$$\|u\|_{\dot{M}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})} \equiv \inf_{\vec{g} \in \mathbb{D}^s(u)} \|\vec{g}\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X},\, \ell^q)}\,,$$

and when $p = \infty$ and $q \in (0,\, \infty)$,

$$\|u\|_{\dot{M}^s_{\infty,\,q}(\mathcal{X})} \equiv \inf_{\vec{g} \in \mathbb{D}^s(u)} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left\{ \sum_{j \geq k} \fint_{B(x,\, 2^{-k})} [g_j(y)]^q \, d\mu(y) \right\}^{1/q}.$$

Definition 3.2. Let $s,\, \sigma \in (0,\, \infty)$, $\epsilon \in [0,\, s]$ and $p,\, q \in (0, \infty]$. For $\vec{E} = \vec{C}^{s,\,\sigma}, \vec{A}^{s,\,\sigma},\, \vec{I}^{s,\,\sigma}$ or $\vec{S}^{s,\,\epsilon,\,\sigma}$, the *homogeneous space* $\vec{E}\dot{F}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ of Triebel-Lizorkin type is defined to be the *collection of all* $u \in L^\sigma_{\rm loc}(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\|u\|_{\vec{E}\dot{F}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})} < \infty$, where when $p \in (0,\, \infty)$,

$$\|u\|_{\vec{E}\dot{F}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})} \equiv \left\| \left(\int_0^\infty [\vec{E}(u)(\cdot,\, t)]^q \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}$$

with the usual modification made when $q = \infty$, and when $p = \infty$ and $q \in (0,\, \infty)$,

$$\|u\|_{\vec{E}\dot{F}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})} \equiv \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sup_{r > 0} \left(\int_0^r \fint_{B(x,\, r)} [\vec{E}(u)(y,\, t)]^q \, d\mu(y) \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{1/q}$$

and when $p,\, q = \infty$, $\|u\|_{\vec{E}\dot{F}_{\infty,\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})} \equiv \|u\|_{\vec{E}\dot{B}_{\infty,\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})}$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let* $s \in (0, \infty)$ *and* $p,\, q \in (0, \infty]$. *Let* $r \equiv \min\{p,\, q\}$.

(i) If $\sigma \in (0,\, r)$, *then* $\dot{M}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) = \vec{C}^{s,\,\sigma}\dot{F}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$.

(ii) If $\sigma \in (0,\, r_*(s))$, *then* $\dot{M}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) = \vec{I}^{s,\,\sigma}\dot{F}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$.

(iii) If $\epsilon \in [0,\, s)$ *and* $\sigma \in (0,\, r_*(s))$, *then* $\dot{M}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) = \vec{S}^{s,\,\epsilon,\,\sigma}\dot{F}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$.

(iv) If $r \in (n/(n+s),\, \infty]$ *and* $\sigma \in (0,\, r_*(s))$, *then* $\dot{M}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) = \vec{A}^{s,\,\sigma}\dot{F}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$.

Proof. The proof of Theorem 3.1 is similar to that of Theorem 2.1. We only sketch it.

By (2.11), we have $\vec{S}^{s,\,\epsilon,\,\sigma}\dot{F}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \vec{I}^{s,\,\sigma}\dot{F}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$.

For $u \in \vec{I}^{s,\,\sigma}\dot{F}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$, by taking $\vec{g} \equiv \{g_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ as in (2.13), similarly to (2.14), we can show that $\|u\|_{\dot{M}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|u\|_{\vec{I}^{s,\,\sigma}\dot{F}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})}$. Hence, $\vec{I}^{s,\,\sigma}\dot{F}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{M}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$.

The result $\dot{M}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \vec{S}^{s,\,\epsilon,\,\sigma}\dot{F}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ follows from an argument similar to that for $\dot{N}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \vec{S}^{s,\,\epsilon,\,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$, where the inequality (2.17) plays an important role. The restriction $\sigma \in (0,\, r_*(s))$ ensures the existence of $\delta \in (0,\, r)$ and $\epsilon' \in (0,\, \epsilon)$ such that

$\sigma \le \delta_*(\epsilon')$. Moreover, by $\delta \in (0,\, r)$, we can use the Fefferman-Stein maximal inequality (see [8]) to obtain

$$\|\{\mathcal{M}_\delta(h_k)\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X},\,\ell^q)} \lesssim \|\vec{h}\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X},\,\ell^q)}.$$

This gives (ii) and (iii).

For (i), by (2.18), we have $\vec{C}^{s,\sigma}\dot{F}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \vec{I}^{s,\sigma}\dot{F}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{M}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$. The converse result $\dot{M}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \vec{C}^{s,\sigma}\dot{F}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ follows from (2.19) and an argument similar to the proof of $\dot{N}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \vec{C}^{s,\sigma}\dot{B}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ for $\sigma \in (0,\, p)$. Here the restriction $\sigma \in (0,\, r)$ comes from the Fefferman-Stein maximal inequality used to prove

$$\|\{\mathcal{M}_\sigma(g_k)\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X},\,\ell^q)} \lesssim \|\vec{g}\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X},\,\ell^q)}.$$

This gives (i).

For (iv), the equivalence $\vec{A}^{s,\sigma}\dot{F}_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) = \dot{M}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ follows from (2.20), (2.21) with $\sigma' \in (\max\{\sigma,\, 1\},\, r_*(s))$ and (ii). This gives (iv) and hence finishes the proof of Theorem 3.1. □

Notice that, in Theorem 3.1 (iii), we have the restriction $\epsilon \in [0,\, s)$. However, when $\epsilon = s$ and $q = \infty$, we have the following result.

Theorem 3.2. *Let* $s \in (0,\infty)$ *and* $p \in (0,\infty]$. *If* $\sigma \in (0,\, p_*(s))$, *then* $\dot{M}^s_{p,\,\infty}(\mathcal{X}) = \vec{S}^{s,\,s,\,\sigma}\dot{F}_{p,\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})$.

Proof. To see $\vec{S}^{s,\,s,\,\sigma}\dot{F}_{p,\,\infty}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{M}^s_{p,\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})$, let $u \in \vec{S}^{s,\,s,\,\sigma}\dot{F}_{p,\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})$. By (2.12) and taking $\vec{g} \equiv \{g_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ with $g_k = S^{s,\,s,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k+2}}(u)$, we have $\vec{g} \in \mathbb{D}^s(u)$ and

$$\|\vec{g}\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X},\,\ell^\infty)} \le \|\{S^{s,\,s,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u)\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X},\,\ell^\infty)} \sim \|u\|_{\vec{S}^{s,\,s,\,\sigma}\dot{F}_{p,\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})},$$

which implies that $u \in \dot{M}^s_{p,\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\|u\|_{\dot{M}^s_{p,\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|u\|_{\vec{S}^{s,\,s,\,\sigma}\dot{F}_{p,\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})}$.

Conversely, let $u \in \dot{M}^s_{p,\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\vec{g} \in \mathbb{D}^s(u)$ with $\|\vec{g}\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X},\,\ell^\infty)} \le 2\|u\|_{\dot{M}^s_{p,\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})}$. Taking $g \equiv \sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} g_k = \|\vec{g}\|_{\ell^\infty}$, we have $g \in \mathcal{D}^s(u)$ and $\|g\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{M}^s_{p,\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})}$. By $\sigma \in (0,\, p_*(s))$, let $\delta \in (0,\, p)$ such that $\sigma = \delta_*(s)$. Then by Lemma 2.2, for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$S^{s,\,s,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k+2}}(u)(x) \le \mathcal{M}_\delta(g)(x),$$

which together with the $L^{p/\delta}(\mathcal{X})$-boundedness of $\mathcal{M}$ implies that $u \in \vec{S}^{s,\,s,\,\sigma}\dot{F}_{p,\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\|u\|_{\vec{S}^{s,\,s,\,\sigma}\dot{F}_{p,\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{M}^s_{p,\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})}$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 3.2. □

Let $s,\, \sigma \in (0,\, \infty)$ and recall the classical *fractional sharp maximal functions*

$$u^{\sharp,\,s}(x) \equiv \sup_{t\in(0,\,\infty)} t^{-s} ⨍_{B(x,\,t)} |u(z) - u_{B(x,\,t)}|\, d\mu(z)$$

and

$$u^{\sharp,\,s}_\sigma(x) \equiv \sup_{t\in(0,\,\infty)} t^{-s} \inf_{c\in\mathbb{R}} \left(⨍_{B(x,\,t)} |u(z) - c|^\sigma\, d\mu(z)\right)^{1/\sigma}.$$

The *Sobolev-type space* $\dot{\mathcal{C}}^{s,\,p}(\mathcal{X})$ of Calderón and DeVore-Sharpley is defined as the *collection of all locally integrable functions* u such that $\|u\|_{\dot{\mathcal{C}}^{s,\,p}(\mathcal{X})} \equiv \|u^{\sharp,\,s}\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} < \infty$; see [4, 24]. Also observe that

$$u^{\sharp,\,s}_{\sigma}(u)(x) = \sup_{t\in(0,\,\infty)} S^{s,\,s,\,\sigma}_t(u)(x) \sim \|\vec{S}^{s,\,s,\sigma}(u)(x)\|_{\ell^\infty},$$

and hence $\|u\|_{\vec{S}^{s,\,s,\,\sigma}\dot{F}_{p,\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})} = \|u^{\sharp,\,s}_{\sigma}(u)\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}$. On the other hand, recall from [19] that $\dot{M}^s_{p,\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})$ is simply the *Hajłasz-Sobolev space* $\dot{M}^{s,p}(\mathcal{X})$. Here $\dot{M}^{s,p}(\mathcal{X})$ is the *collection of all functions* u such that

$$\|u\|_{\dot{M}^{s,\,p}(\mathcal{X})} \equiv \inf_{g\in\mathcal{D}^s(u)} \|g\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} < \infty,$$

where $\mathcal{D}^s(u)$ is the *set of all s-gradients of u* as in (2.1). Then, as a consequence of Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 3.1. *Let $s \in (0,\,\infty)$ and $p \in (0,\,\infty]$.*

(i) If $\sigma \in (0,\,p_*(s))$, then $u \in \dot{M}^{s,p}(\mathcal{X})$ if and only if $u^{\sharp,\,s}_{\sigma} \in L^p(\mathcal{X})$, and moreover, for every $u \in \dot{M}^{s,p}(\mathcal{X})$, $\|u\|_{\dot{M}^{s,\,p}(\mathcal{X})} \sim \|u^{\sharp,\,s}_{\sigma}(u)\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}$.

(ii) If $p \in (n/(n+s),\,\infty]$, then $\dot{\mathcal{C}}^{s,p}(\mathcal{X}) = \dot{M}^{s,p}(\mathcal{X})$.

Remark 3.1. Notice that $\dot{M}^s_{p,\,p}(\mathcal{X}) = \dot{B}^s_{p,\,p}(\mathcal{X})$ for all $s \in (0,\,\infty)$ and $p \in (0,\infty]$. Then (v) through (vii) of Theorem 1.1 also give the optimality of the ranges of σ and ϵ in Theorem 3.1 at least for the spaces $\dot{M}^s_{p,\,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Remark 3.2. Recall that Calderón [2] characterized Sobolev spaces $W^{1,\,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for $p \in (1,\,\infty]$ via the fractional sharp maximal function $u^{\sharp,\,1}$ and Miyachi [20] characterized Hardy-Sobolev spaces $H^{1,\,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for $p \in (n/(n+1),\,1]$. For the theory of Sobolev-type spaces $\dot{\mathcal{C}}^{s,\,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and their equivalence with the usual Triebel-Lizorkin spaces $\dot{F}^s_{p,\,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, see [4, 3]. Shvartsman [24] introduced the spaces $\dot{\mathcal{C}}^{s,\,p}(\mathcal{X})$ on metric measure spaces for $s \in (0,\,1]$ and $p \in (1,\,\infty]$. See [26] and the references therein for the fractional sharp maximal function characterization of general Triebel-Lizorkin spaces on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

The pointwise Sobolev spaces on metric measure spaces were introduced and the pointwise characterization of $W^{1,\,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for $p \in (1,\,\infty]$ was established by Hajłasz [12, 13]. The pointwise characterization for the Hardy-Sobolev spaces $H^{1,\,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for $p \in (n/(n+1),\,1]$ was given by Koskela and Saksman [16]. Yang [27] established a pointwise characterization for the Triebel-Lizorkin spaces $\dot{F}^s_{p,\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})$ for $s \in (0,\,1)$ and $p \in (1,\,\infty]$ on Ahlfors regular spaces. For the pointwise characterization $\dot{M}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X}) = \dot{F}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ on a metric measure space satisfying doubling and reverse doubling properties, when $s \in (0,\,1)$ and $p,\,q \in (n/(n+s),\,\infty]$, see [18, 19]; also see [9, 6, 21] for some other characterizations. Above, the spaces $\dot{F}^s_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ are defined using kernel functions.

By Theorem 3.1, Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 3.1, Hajłasz-Triebel-Lizorkin spaces appear to be a natural substitute of Triebel-Lizorkin spaces on a metric measure space satisfying the doubling property.

4 Triviality and nontriviality

We say that $\mathcal{X}$ supports a *weak* $(1,\, p)$*-Poincaré inequality* with $p \in [1,\, \infty)$ if there exist positive constants C and $\lambda > 1$ such that for all functions u, p-weak upper gradients g of u and balls B with radius $r > 0$,

$$\fint_B |u(x) - u_B|\, d\mu(x) \le Cr \left\{ \fint_{\lambda B} [g(x)]^p \, d\mu(x) \right\}^{1/p}.$$

Recall that a nonnegative Borel function g is called a *p-weak upper gradient of u* if

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \le \int_\gamma g\, ds \tag{4.1}$$

for all $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\mathrm{rect}} \setminus \Gamma$, where x and y are the endpoints of γ, Γ_{rect} denotes the collection of non-constant compact rectifiable curves and Γ has p-modulus zero. If $\mathcal{X}$ is complete, the above Poincaré inequality holds if and only if it holds for each Lipschitz function with the pointwise Lipschitz constant

$$\mathrm{Lip}(u)(x) = \limsup_{r \to 0} \sup_{y \in B(x,\, r)} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{r}$$

on the right-hand side. See [11] for more details.

By triviality of $\dot{N}^s_{p,\, q}(\mathcal{X})$ or $\dot{M}^s_{p,\, q}(\mathcal{X})$ below we mean that they only contain constant functions. In order to obtain such a conclusion, one needs some connectivity assumption on $\mathcal{X}$; simply consider $B(0,\, 1) \cup B(x_0,\, 1)$ where $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $|x_0| > 3$, equipped with the Euclidean distance and Lebesgue measure. Then $\chi_{B(0,\,1)} \in \dot{M}^s_{p,\, q}(\mathcal{X}) \cap \dot{N}^s_{p,\, q}(\mathcal{X})$ for all s, p, q. Notice that $\mathcal{X}$ does not support any Poincaré inequality.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that $\mathcal{X}$ supports a weak $(1,\, p)$-Poincaré inequality with $p \in (1,\, \infty)$. Then for all $q \in (0,\, \infty)$, $\dot{N}^1_{p,\, q}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\dot{M}^1_{p,\, q}(\mathcal{X})$ are trivial.*

Proof. Since for $q \in (0,\, p)$, $\dot{M}^1_{p,\, q}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{M}^1_{p,\, p}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\dot{N}^1_{p,\, q}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{N}^1_{p,\, p}(\mathcal{X}) = \dot{M}^1_{p,\, p}(\mathcal{X})$, we only need to prove that for $q \in [p,\, \infty)$, $\dot{M}^1_{p,\, q}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\dot{N}^1_{p,\, q}(\mathcal{X})$ are trivial. Assume that $q \in [p,\, \infty)$. Notice that $\dot{M}^1_{p,\, q}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{M}^1_{p,\, \infty}(\mathcal{X}) = \dot{M}^{1,\, p}(\mathcal{X})$, where $\dot{M}^{1,\, p}(\mathcal{X})$ is the Hajłasz-Sobolev space [12]. Moreover, under the weak $(1,\, p)$-Poincaré inequality, it is known that $\dot{M}^{1,\, p}(\mathcal{X}) = \dot{N}^{1,\, p}(\mathcal{X})$ (see [23, Theorem 4.9] and [15]), where $\dot{N}^{1,\, p}(\mathcal{X})$ is the Newtonian Sobolev space introduced in [23]. So $\dot{M}^1_{p,\, q}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{N}^{1,\, p}(\mathcal{X})$. Let $u \in \dot{M}^1_{p,\, q}(\mathcal{X})$. Then $u \in \dot{N}^{1,\, p}(\mathcal{X})$. The proof of the triviality of $\dot{M}^1_{p,\, q}(\mathcal{X})$ is reduced to proving $\|u\|_{\dot{N}^{1,\, p}(\mathcal{X})} = 0$. To this end, it suffices to find a sequence $\{\rho_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of p-weak upper gradients of u such that $\|\rho_k\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$.

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, set

$$\rho_k(x) \equiv \sup_{j \ge k} 2^j \fint_{B(x,\, 2^{-j})} |u(z) - u_{B(x,\, 2^{-j})}|\, d\mu(z).$$

Then ρ_k is nonnegative Borel measurable function for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, we have that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \rho_k(x) = 0$ for almost all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Indeed, by a discrete variant of Theorem 3.1 (ii),

$$\left\| \left\{ I^{1,\,1}_{2^{-j}}(u) \right\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X},\,\ell^q)} \sim \|u\|_{\dot{M}^1_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})} < \infty,$$

which implies that $\|\{I^{1,\,1}_{2^{-j}}(u)(x)\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_{\ell^q} < \infty$ and hence $\rho_k(x) \le \|\{I^{1,\,1}_{2^{-j}}(u)(x)\}_{j\ge k}\|_{\ell^q} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ for almost all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Moreover, applying the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, we have $\|\rho_k\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$.

Now it suffices to check that ρ_k is a p-weak upper gradient of u. Observe that if $\rho_k(x) < \infty$, then $\lim_{j\to\infty} u_{B(x,\,2^{-j})}$ exists. In fact, we have

$$|u_{B(x,\,2^{-j})} - u_{B(x,\,2^{-\ell})}| \lesssim 2^{-\min\{j,\,\ell\}}\rho_k(x) \to 0$$

as $j,\,\ell \to \infty$. For such an x, we define $\widetilde{u}(x) \equiv \lim_{j\to\infty} u_{B(x,\,2^{-j})}$. Generally, for $x \in \mathcal{X}$, if $\lim_{j\to\infty} u_{B(x,\,2^{-j})}$ exists, then we define $\widetilde{u}(x) \equiv \lim_{j\to\infty} u_{B(x,\,2^{-j})}$; otherwise, $\widetilde{u}(x) \equiv 0$. Obviously, $u(x) = \widetilde{u}(x)$ for almost all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and hence u and $\widetilde{u}$ generate the same element of $\dot{N}^{1,\,p}(\mathcal{X})$. Therefore we only need to check that ρ_k is a p-weak upper gradient of $\widetilde{u}$. To this end, notice that for all $x,\,y \in \mathcal{X}$ with $d(x,\,y) \le 2^{-k-2}$, we have

$$|\widetilde{u}(x) - \widetilde{u}(y)| \le d(x,\,y)[\rho_k(x) + \rho_k(y)].$$

Moreover, by [23, Proposition 3.1], u is absolutely continuous on p-almost every curve, namely, $u \circ \gamma$ is absolutely continuous on $[0,\,\ell(\gamma)]$ for all arc-length parameterized paths $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\mathrm{rect}} \setminus \Gamma$, where Γ has p-modulus zero. For every $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\mathrm{rect}} \setminus \Gamma$, we will show that (4.1) holds. To see this, by the absolute continuity of u on γ, it suffices to show that for j large enough,

$$2^j \left| \int_0^{2^{-j}} u\circ\gamma(t)\,dt - \int_{\ell(\gamma)-2^{-j}}^{\ell(\gamma)} u\circ\gamma(t)\,dt \right| \lesssim \int_0^{\ell(\gamma)} \rho_k\circ\gamma(t)\,dz.$$

But, borrowing some ideas from [1], for j large enough, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&2^j \left| \int_0^{2^{-j}} u\circ\gamma(t)\,dt - \int_{\ell(\gamma)-2^{-j}}^{\ell(\gamma)} u\circ\gamma(t)\,dt \right| \\
&\quad = 2^j \left| \int_0^{\ell(\gamma)-2^{-j}} [u\circ\gamma(t+2^{-j}) - u\circ\gamma(t)]\,dt \right| \\
&\quad \le 2^j \int_0^{\ell(\gamma)-2^{-j}} \left|u\circ\gamma(t+2^{-j}) - u\circ\gamma(t)\right|\,dt \\
&\quad \lesssim \int_0^{\ell(\gamma)-2^{-j}} \left[\rho_k\circ\gamma(t+2^{-j}) + \rho_k\circ\gamma(t)\right]\,dt \\
&\quad \lesssim \int_0^{\ell(\gamma)} \rho_k\circ\gamma(t)\,dt.
\end{aligned}$$

This means that ρ_k is a p-weak upper gradient of $\widetilde{u}$.

To prove the triviality of $\dot{N}^1_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ with $q \in (p,\,\infty)$, for $u \in \dot{N}^1_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$, applying Theorem 2.1, we have

$$\|\{I^{1,\,1}_{2^{-k}}(u)\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_{\ell^q(L^p(\mathcal{X}))} \sim \|u\|_{\dot{N}^1_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})} < \infty,$$

which implies that $\|I^{1,\,1}_{2^{-k}}(u)\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. For every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $\{x_{k,\,i}\}_i$ be a maximal set of $\mathcal{X}$ with $d(x_{k,\,i},\,x_{k,\,j}) \geq 2^{-k-2}$ for all $i \neq j$. Then $\mathcal{B}_k = \{B(x_{k,\,i},\,2^{-k})\}_i$ is a covering of $\mathcal{X}$ with bounded overlap. Let $\{\varphi_{k,\,i}\}_i$ be a partition of unity with respect to $\mathcal{B}_k$ as in [14, Lemma 5.2]. We define a discrete convolution approximation to u by $u_{\mathcal{B}_k} = \sum_i u_{B(x_{k,\,i},\,2^{-k})}\varphi_{k,\,i}$. By an argument similar to that of [14, Lemma 5.3], we have that $u_{\mathcal{B}_k} \to u$ in $L^p_{\rm loc}(\mathcal{X})$ and hence in $L^1_{\rm loc}(\mathcal{X})$ as $k \to \infty$, and that $\operatorname{Lip} u_{\mathcal{B}_k}(x) \leq CI^{1,\,1}_{2^{-k+N}}(u)(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, where $C \geq 1$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ are constants independent of k, x and u. Now $CI^{1,\,1}_{2^{-k+N}}(u)$ is an upper gradient of $u_{\mathcal{B}_k}$. So, for every ball $B = B(x_B,\,r_B)$, by the weak $(1,\,p)$-Poincaré inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\fint_B |u(z) - u_B|\,d\mu(z) &= \lim_{k\to\infty} \fint_B |u_{\mathcal{B}_k}(z) - (u_{\mathcal{B}_k})_B|\,d\mu(z)\\ &\lesssim \liminf_{k\to\infty} r_B \left\{\fint_{B(x_B,\,\lambda r_B)} [I^{1,\,1}_{2^{-k+N}}(u)(z)]^p\,d\mu(z)\right\}^{1/p} = 0,\end{aligned}$$

which implies that u is a constant on B and hence is a constant function on $\mathcal{X}$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 4.1. □

Remark 4.1. (i) Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.1, $\dot{M}^1_{p,\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})$ is not necessarily trivial; $\dot{M}^1_{p,\,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n) = \dot{W}^{1,\,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Also $\dot{N}^1_{p,\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})$ is not necessarily trivial; $\dot{N}^1_{p,\,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ contains smooth functions with compact supports. The argument at the end of the proof of Theorem 4.1 is due to Eero Saksman and Tomás Soto.

(ii) Theorem 4.1 when $p = q = n$ was established in [1].

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose that $\mathcal{X}$ supports a weak $(1,\,p)$-Poincaré inequality with $p \in (1,\,\infty)$. Let $s \in (1,\,\infty)$. Then for $q \in (0,\,\infty]$, $\dot{M}^s_{np/(n+ps-p),\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ is trivial, and for $q \in (0,\,np/(n+ps-p)]$, $\dot{N}^s_{np/(n+ps-p),\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ is trivial. Moreover, if either $\mathcal{X}$ is complete or $\mathcal{X}$ supports a weak $(1,\,p-\epsilon)$-Poincaré inequality for some $\epsilon \in (0,\,p-1)$, then for $q \in (np/(n+ps-p),\,\infty]$, $\dot{N}^s_{np/(n+ps-p),\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ is trivial.*

Proof. We first prove the triviality of $\dot{M}^s_{np/(n+ps-p),\,\infty}(\mathcal{X}) = \dot{M}^{s,\,np/(n+ps-p)}(\mathcal{X})$ by considering the following three cases: Case $\mu(\mathcal{X}) < \infty$, Case $\mu(\mathcal{X}) = \infty$ and $\mathcal{X}$ is Ahlfors n-regular, and Case $\mu(\mathcal{X}) = \infty$ but $\mathcal{X}$ is not Ahlfors n-regular.

Case $\mu(\mathcal{X}) < \infty$. Notice that by (2.10), $2^{-k_0-1} \leq \operatorname{diam}\mathcal{X} < 2^{-k_0}$ for some $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$. In this case, it suffices to prove that $\dot{M}^{s,\,np/(n+ps-p)}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{M}^1_{p,\,\sigma}(\mathcal{X})$ for some $\sigma \in (0,\,p)$; then the triviality of $\dot{M}^{s,\,np/(n+ps-p)}(\mathcal{X})$ follows from that of $\dot{M}^1_{p,\,\sigma}(\mathcal{X})$ as proved by Theorem 4.1. To this end, let $u \in \dot{M}^{s,\,np/(n+ps-p)}(\mathcal{X})$ and let $g \in \mathcal{D}^s(u)$ with $\|g\|_{L^{np/(n+ps-p)}(\mathcal{X})} \leq 2\|u\|_{\dot{M}^{s,\,np/(n+ps-p)}(\mathcal{X})}$. We claim that there exists $\sigma \in (0,\,p)$ such that

$$\|\{I^{1,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u)\}_{k\geq k_0-2}\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X},\,\ell^\sigma)} \lesssim \|g\|_{L^{np/(n+ps-p)}(\mathcal{X})}. \tag{4.2}$$

Assume that this claim holds for a moment. By Theorem 3.1(ii) and a variant of Lemma 2.5, we have $u \in \dot{M}^1_{p,\,\sigma}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\|u\|_{\dot{M}^1_{p,\,\sigma}(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{M}^{s,\,np/(n+ps-p)}(\mathcal{X})}$.

To prove (4.2), by Lemma 2.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\{I^{1,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u)(x)\}_{k\ge k_0-2}\|^{\sigma}_{\ell^{\sigma}} &= \sum_{k\ge k_0-2} 2^{k\sigma} \inf_{c\in\mathbb{R}} \fint_{B(x,\,2^{-k})} |u(z)-c|^{\sigma}\,d\mu(z)\\
&\lesssim \sum_{k\ge k_0-2} 2^{-k(s-1)\sigma} \fint_{B(x,\,2^{-k})} [g(z)]^{\sigma}\,d\mu(z)\\
&\lesssim \sum_{k\ge k_0-2} \frac{2^{-k(s-1)\sigma}}{\mu(B(x,\,2^{-k}))} \sum_{j\ge k} \int_{B(x,\,2^{-j})\setminus B(x,\,2^{-j-1})} [g(z)]^{\sigma}\,d\mu(z).
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that there exists $0<\kappa\le n$ such that for $j\ge k$,

$$\mu(B(x,\,2^{-k})) \gtrsim \mu(B(x,\,2^{-j}))2^{-(k-j)\kappa};$$

see [28]. Choosing $\sigma\in(0,\,p)$ such that $\kappa-(s-1)\sigma>0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\{I^{1,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u)(x)\}_{k\ge k_0-2}\|^{\sigma}_{\ell^{\sigma}}\\
&\quad\lesssim \sum_{j\ge k_0-2} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x,\,2^{-j}))} \sum_{k=k_0-2}^{j} 2^{-k(s-1)\sigma}2^{(k-j)\kappa} \int_{B(x,\,2^{-j})\setminus B(x,\,2^{-j-1})} [g(z)]^{\sigma}\,d\mu(z)\\
&\quad\lesssim \sum_{j\ge k_0-2} \frac{2^{-j(s-1)\sigma}}{\mu(B(x,\,2^{-j}))} \int_{B(x,\,2^{-j})\setminus B(x,\,2^{-j-1})} [g(z)]^{\sigma}\,d\mu(z)\\
&\quad\lesssim \mathcal{I}_{(s-1)\sigma}(g^{\sigma})(x),
\end{aligned}\tag{4.3}$$

where for $\alpha\in(0,\,n)$, $\mathcal{I}_{\alpha}$ denotes the *fractional integral* defined by

$$\mathcal{I}_{\alpha}(u)(x) \equiv \int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{[d(x,\,y)]^{\alpha}}{\mu(B(x,\,d(x,\,y)))} u(y)\,d\mu(y).$$

Therefore,

$$\|\{I^{1,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u)\}_{k\ge k_0-2}\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X},\,\ell^{\sigma})} \lesssim \|[\mathcal{I}_{(s-1)\sigma}(g^{\sigma})]^{1/\sigma}\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \sim \|\mathcal{I}_{(s-1)\sigma}(g^{\sigma})\|^{1/\sigma}_{L^{p/\sigma}(\mathcal{X})}.$$

Notice that for all $x\in\mathcal{X}$ and $r\le \operatorname{diam}\mathcal{X}$,

$$\mu(B(x,\,r)) \ge C\mu(\mathcal{X})\frac{r^n}{(\operatorname{diam}\mathcal{X})^n} \gtrsim r^n.$$

Recall that $\mathcal{I}_{\alpha}$ is bounded from $L^p(\mathcal{X})$ to $L^{p_*(\alpha)}(\mathcal{X})$ for all $p\in(1,\,n/\alpha)$; see, for example, [10, Theorem 3.22]. We have

$$\|\{I^{1,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u)\}_{k\ge k_0-2}\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X},\,\ell^{\sigma})} \lesssim \|g^{\sigma}\|^{1/\sigma}_{L^{np/(n+ps-p)\sigma}(\mathcal{X})} \sim \|g\|_{L^{np/(n+ps-p)}(\mathcal{X})},$$

which gives (4.2).

Case $\mu(\mathcal{X}) = \infty$ *and* $\mathcal{X}$ *is Ahlfors* n*-regular.* Recall that $\mathcal{X}$ is *Ahlfors* n*-regular* if for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r > 0$,

$$\mu(B(x,\, r)) \sim r^n.$$

Observe that the fractional integral $\mathcal{I}_\alpha$ is still bounded from $L^p(\mathcal{X})$ to $L^{p_*(\alpha)}(\mathcal{X})$, and hence by an argument similar to above, we have $\dot{M}^{s,\,np/(n+ps-p)}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{M}^1_{p,\,\sigma}(\mathcal{X})$ for some $\sigma \in (0,\, p)$, which implies the triviality of $\dot{M}^{s,\,np/(n+ps-p)}(\mathcal{X})$.

Case $\mu(\mathcal{X}) = \infty$ *but* $\mathcal{X}$ *is not Ahlfors* n*-regular.* Notice that, in this case, we do not have the boundedness from $L^p(\mathcal{X})$ to $L^{p_*(\alpha)}(\mathcal{X})$ of the fractional integral $\mathcal{I}_\alpha$ and hence we cannot prove $\dot{M}^{s,\,np/(n+ps-p)}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{M}^1_{p,\,\sigma}(\mathcal{X})$ for some $\sigma \in (0,\, p)$ as above. But the ideas of an imbedding as above and the proof of Theorem 4.1 still work here for a localized version. Indeed, we will show that any function $u \in \dot{M}^{s,\,np/(n+ps-p)}(\mathcal{X})$ is constant on every ball of $\mathcal{X}$, which implies that u is a constant function on whole $\mathcal{X}$.

To this end, let $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$, k_0 be a negative integer and let η be a cutoff functions such that $\eta(x) = 1 - \operatorname{dist}(x,\, B(x_0,\, 2^{-k_0}))$ on $B(x_0,\, 2^{-k_0+1})$ and $\eta(x) = 0$ on $\mathcal{X} \setminus B(x_0,\, 2^{-k_0+1})$. Observe that $\eta(x) = 1$ on $B(x_0,\, 2^{-k_0})$.

For every $u \in \dot{M}^{s,\,np/(n+ps-p)}(\mathcal{X})$ with $g \in \mathcal{D}^s(u) \cap L^{np/(n+ps-p)}(\mathcal{X})$, we first claim that $u\eta \in \dot{M}^{1,\,p}(\mathcal{X})$. Indeed, if $x,\, y \in B(x_0,\, 2^{-k_0+2})$,

$$\begin{aligned}|u(x)\eta(x) - u(y)\eta(y)| &= |u(x) - u(y)|\eta(x) + |u(x)||\eta(x) - \eta(y)|\\ &\le |u(x) - u(y)| + d(x,\, y)[|u(x)| + |u(y)|]\\ &\le d(x,\, y)[|u(x)| + |u(y)| + h(x) + h(y)]\end{aligned}$$

with $h = \chi_{B(x_0,\, 2^{-k_0+2})} \sum_{j \ge k_0-4} 2^{(k_0-j)} I^{1,\,\sigma}_{2^{-j}}(u)$; if $x,\, y \in \mathcal{X} \setminus B(x_0,\, 2^{-k_0+1})$, $u(x)\chi(x) = 0 = u(y)\chi(y)$; if $x \in B(x_0,\, 2^{-k_0+1})$ and $y \in \mathcal{X} \setminus B(x_0,\, 2^{-k_0+2})$ or $y \in B(x_0,\, 2^{-k_0+1})$ and $x \in \mathcal{X} \setminus B(x_0,\, 2^{-k_0+2})$, then by $d(x,\, y) \ge 2^{-k_0}$, we have

$$|u(x)\chi(x) - u(y)\chi(y)| = |u(x)| + |u(y)| \le 2^{k_0} d(x,\, y)[|u(x)| + |u(y)|].$$

This means that $(u\chi_{B(x_0,\, 2^{-k_0+2})} + h) \in \mathcal{D}^1(u)$ modulo a constant depending on k_0. Notice that, by Lemma 2.2, $u \in L^p_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathcal{X})$. So to obtain $(u\chi_{B(x_0,\, 2^{-k_0+2})} + h) \in L^p(\mathcal{X})$, it suffices to prove that $h \in L^p(\mathcal{X})$. For $\alpha \in (0,\, n)$, define the *local fractional integral* by

$$\mathcal{J}_\alpha(g)(x) = \int_{d(x,\, y) \le 2^{-k_0+4}} \frac{[d(x,\, y)]^\alpha}{\mu(B(x,\, d(x,\, y)))} g(y)\, d\mu(y).$$

By an argument similar to that of (4.3), for $x \in B(x_0,\, 2^{-k_0+2})$, we still have

$$h(x) \le \|\{I^{1,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u)(x)\}_{k \ge k_0-4}\|_{\ell^\sigma} \lesssim \left[\mathcal{J}_{(s-1)\sigma}(g^\sigma \chi_{B(x_0,\, 2^{-k_0+4})})(x)\right]^{1/\sigma}.$$

Obviously, $\mathcal{J}_{(s-1)\sigma}(g^\sigma \chi_{B(x_0,\, 2^{-k_0+4})})$ is supported in $B(x_0,\, 2^{-k_0+8})$. Moreover, by an argument similar to that of [10, Theorem 3.22], for $\alpha \in (0,\, n)$ one can prove that $\mathcal{J}_\alpha$ is bounded from $L^p(B(x_0,\, 2^{-k_0+4}))$ to $L^{p_*(\alpha)}(\mathcal{X})$ with its operator norm depending on k_0, x_0, α and $\mathcal{X}$. This together with an argument similar to that for the case $\mu(\mathcal{X}) < \infty$ implies that $h \in L^p(\mathcal{X})$ and hence the claim that $u\eta \in \dot{M}^{1,\,p}(\mathcal{X})$.

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, set

$$\widetilde{\rho}_k(x) \equiv \sup_{j\ge k} 2^j \left(\inf_{c\in\mathbb{R}} ⨍_{B(x,\,2^{-j})} |(u\eta)(z) - c|^\sigma \, d\mu(z)\right)^{1/\sigma}.$$

Since $u\eta \in \dot{M}^{1,\,p}(\mathcal{X})$, as what we did in the proof of Theorem 4.1, we can show that $\widetilde{\rho}_k$ is a p-weak upper gradient of $\widetilde{u\eta}$. Notice that $\widetilde{u\eta}(x) = u(x)\eta(x) = u(x)$ for almost all $x \in B(x_0,\,2^{-k_0})$, and that for all $x \in B(x_0,\,2^{-k_0-1})$ and $j \ge k \ge k_0$, $(u\eta)_{B(x,\,2^{-j})} = u_{B(x,\,2^{-j})}$, and hence $\widetilde{\rho}_k(x) = \sup_{j\ge k} I_k^{1,\,\sigma}(u)(x)$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\left\{I^{1,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u)\right\}_{k\ge k_0}\right\|_{L^p(B(x_0,\,2^{-k_0-1}),\,\ell^\sigma)} &\lesssim \left\|\left[\mathcal{J}_{(s-1)\sigma}(g^\sigma \chi_{B(x_0,\,2^{-k_0+4})})\right]^{1/\sigma}\right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}\\ &\lesssim \|g\|_{L^{np/(n+ps-p)}(B(x_0,\,2^{-k_0+4}))} < \infty,\end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\|\{I^{1,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u)(x)\}_{k\ge k_0}\|_{\ell^\sigma} < \infty$ and hence $\widetilde{\rho}_k(x) \le \|\{I^{1,\,\sigma}_{2^{-j}}(u)(x)\}_{j\ge k}\|_{\ell^\sigma} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ for almost all $x \in B(x_0,\,2^{-k_0-1})$. Then by the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, we have $\|\widetilde{\rho}_k\|_{L^p(B(x_0,\,2^{-k_0-1}))} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Applying the Poincaré inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\inf_{c\in\mathbb{R}} ⨍_{B(x_0,\,2^{-k_0-1}/\lambda)} |u(z) - u_{B(x,\,2^{-k_0-1}/\lambda)}| \, d\mu(z)\\ &\quad = \inf_{c\in\mathbb{R}} ⨍_{B(x_0,\,2^{-k_0-1}/\lambda)} |(u\eta)(z) - (u\eta)_{B(x,\,2^{-k_0-1}/\lambda)}| \, d\mu(z)\\ &\quad \lesssim \left(⨍_{B(x_0,\,2^{-k_0-1})} \widetilde{\rho}_k^{\,p}(z) \, d\mu(z)\right)^{1/p} \to 0.\end{aligned}$$

This means that u is a constant on $B(x,\,2^{-k_0-1}/\lambda)$. Since k_0 is arbitrary, we conclude that u is a constant function.

Moreover, for $q \in (0,\,\infty]$, the triviality of $\dot{M}^s_{np/(n+ps-p),\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ follows from

$$\dot{M}^s_{np/(n+ps-p),\,q}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{M}^{s,\,np/(n+ps-p)}(\mathcal{X}).$$

Meanwhile, for $q \in (0,\,np/(n+ps-p)]$, the triviality of $\dot{N}^s_{np/(n+ps-p),\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ follows from

$$\dot{N}^s_{np/(n+ps-p),\,q}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{M}^s_{np/(n+ps-p),\,np/(n+ps-p)}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{M}^{s,\,np/(n+ps-p)}(\mathcal{X}).$$

Finally, we prove the triviality of $\dot{N}^s_{np/(n+ps-p),\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ for $q \in (np/(n+ps-p),\,\infty]$. In fact, it follows from the triviality of $\dot{N}^s_{np/(n+ps-p),\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})$ since $\dot{N}^s_{np/(n+ps-p),\,q}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{N}^s_{np/(n+ps-p),\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})$. To see the triviality of $\dot{N}^s_{np/(n+ps-p),\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})$, we need the additional condition that $\mathcal{X}$ supports a weak $(1,\,p-\epsilon)$-Poincaré inequality for some $\epsilon \in (0,\,p-1)$. Recall from [15] that if $\mathcal{X}$ is complete and supports the weak $(1,\,p)$-Poincaré inequality, then $\mathcal{X}$ supports a weak $(1,\, p-\epsilon)$-Poincaré inequality for some $\epsilon \in (0,\, p-1)$. Without loss of generality, we can ask ϵ close to 0 such that

$$t \equiv s + \frac{n}{p} - \frac{n}{p-\epsilon} > 1.$$

Observe that

$$\frac{np}{n+p(s-1)} = \frac{n(p-\epsilon)}{n+(p-\epsilon)(t-1)}. \tag{4.4}$$

Now we will consider the following two cases: $\mu(\mathcal{X}) < \infty$ and $\mu(\mathcal{X}) = \infty$.

Case $\mu(\mathcal{X}) < \infty$. Assume that $2^{-k_0-1} \le \operatorname{diam} \mathcal{X} < 2^{-k_0}$ for some $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$. We claim that $\dot{N}^s_{np/(n+ps-p),\,\infty}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{M}^t_{np/(n+ps-p),\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})$ for any $t \in (1,\, s)$. Indeed, for every $u \in \dot{N}^s_{np/(n+ps-p),\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})$,

$$\left\| \sup_{k \ge k_0-2} I^{t,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u) \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \sim \left\| \sup_{k \ge k_0-2} 2^{-k(s-t)} I^{s,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u) \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \left\| S^{s,\,t,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k_0+2}}(u) \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}. \tag{4.5}$$

Since

$$\|u\|_{\dot{N}^s_{np/(n+ps-p),\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})} \sim \sup_{k \ge k_0-2} \left\| S^{s,\,t,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u) \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}$$

and

$$\|u\|_{\dot{M}^t_{np/(n+ps-p),\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})} \sim \left\| \sup_{k \ge k_0-2} I^{t,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u) \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})},$$

we conclude that $\|u\|_{\dot{M}^t_{np/(n+ps-p),\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{N}^s_{np/(n+ps-p),\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})}$ and hence our claim. Then the triviality of $\dot{N}^s_{np/(n+ps-p),\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})$ follows from that of $\dot{M}^t_{n(p-\epsilon)/[n+(p-\epsilon)(t-1)],\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})$ and (4.4).

Case $\mu(\mathcal{X}) = \infty$. Since the constant in (4.5) depends on k_0 and hence the diameter of $\mathcal{X}$, we can not get the imbedding $\dot{N}^s_{np/(n+ps-p),\,\infty}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{M}^t_{np/(n+ps-p),\,\infty}(\mathcal{X})$ for $t \in (1,\, s)$. But for any fixed $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$, we still have

$$\begin{aligned}\left\| \sup_{k \ge k_0-16} I^{t,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u) \right\|_{L^p(B(x_0,\,2^{-k_0+8}))} &\sim \left\| \sup_{k \ge k_0-16} 2^{-k(s-t)} I^{s,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k}}(u) \right\|_{L^p(B(x_0,\,2^{-k_0+8}))} \\ &\lesssim \left\| S^{s,\,t,\,\sigma}_{2^{-k_0+16}}(u) \right\|_{L^p(B(x_0,\,2^{-k_0+8}))} < \infty,\end{aligned}$$

which further means that $u \in M^{t,\,n(p-\epsilon)/[n+(p-\epsilon)(t-1)]}(B(x_0,\, 2^{-k_0+8}))$. With the weak $(1,\, p-\epsilon)$-Poincaré inequality in hand, by adapting the arguments in *Case* $\mu(\mathcal{X})$ *but* $\mathcal{X}$ *is not Ahlfor n-regular* as above, we still can prove that u is constant on ball $B(x_0,\, 2^{k_0-1}/\lambda)$. Hence u is a constant function on whole $\mathcal{X}$. We omit the details. This finishes the proof of Theorem 4.2. □

Finally, we give an example to show the "necessity" of the weak $(1,\, n)$-Poincaré inequality to ensure the triviality of $\dot{B}^s_{n/s,\,n/s}(\mathcal{X})$ for $s \in [1,\, \infty)$.

Theorem 4.3. *For each $p \in (2, \infty)$, there exists an Ahlfors 2-regular space $\mathcal{X}$ such that $\mathcal{X}$ supports a weak $(1, p)$-Poincaré inequality but for every $s \in (0, \infty)$, $\dot{B}^s_{2/s,\, 2/s}(\mathcal{X})$ is not trivial.*

Proof. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and E_α be the cantor set in $[0, 1]$ obtained by first removing an interval of length $1 - \alpha$ and leaving two intervals of length $\alpha/2$ and then continuing inductively. The Hausdorff dimension d_α of E_α is $\log 2/\log(2/\alpha)$. The space $\mathcal{X}_\alpha$ is obtained by replacing each of the complementary intervals of E_α by a closed square having that interval as one of its diagonals. Then $\mathcal{X}_\alpha$ is Ahlfors 2-regular with respect to Euclidean distance and by [17, Theorem 3.1], for any

$$p > \frac{2 - d_\alpha}{1 - d_\alpha} = 2 + \frac{\log 2}{-\log \alpha},$$

$\mathcal{X}_\alpha$ supports the $(1, p)$-Poincaré inequality.

So for any $p > 2$, choosing $\alpha \in (0, 2^{-1/(p-2)})$, we know that $\mathcal{X}_\alpha$ supports the weak $(1, p)$-Poincaré inequality. Moreover, for any $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{X}_\alpha$, define the Cantor function by $u(x) = \mathcal{H}^{d_\alpha}([0, x_1] \cap E_\alpha)$. Then u is constant on each square generating $\mathcal{X}_\alpha$ and moreover, $|u(x) - u(y)| \le |x_1 - y_1|^{d_\alpha} \lesssim [d(x, y)]^{d_\alpha}$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{X}_\alpha$ (see [14]). For $s > d_\alpha$, taking $g(x) = 2[d(x, E_\alpha)]^{d_\alpha - s}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}_\alpha$, we have $g \in \mathcal{D}^s(u)$. We claim that $g \in L^q(\mathcal{X}_\alpha)$ if

$$0 < q < \frac{2 - d_\alpha}{s - d_\alpha} = \frac{\log 2 - 2\log \alpha}{(s-1)\log 2 - s \log \alpha}.$$

Indeed, on each square $Q \subset \mathcal{X}_\alpha$ with diagonal length $2^{-j}\alpha^j(1 - \alpha)$, we have

$$\int_Q [g(x)]^q \, dx \lesssim [2^{-j}\alpha^j]^{(d_\alpha - s)q + 2}$$

since $(d_\alpha - s)q + 1 > -1$, namely, $q < 2/(s - d_\alpha)$ which is given by $q < (2 - d_\alpha)/(s - d_\alpha)$. Observing that there are 2^j such squares, we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}_\alpha} [g(x)]^q \, dx \lesssim \sum_{j \ge 1} 2^j [2^{-j}\alpha^j]^{(d_\alpha - s)q + 2} \lesssim \sum_{j \ge 1} 2^{j - j[(d_\alpha - s)q + 2](1 - \log\alpha/\log 2)} < \infty,$$

where in the last inequality we use

$$1 - [(d_\alpha - s)q + 2](1 - \log\alpha/\log 2) = 1 - [(d_\alpha - s)q + 2]/d_\alpha < 0,$$

which is equivalent to $q < (2 - d_\alpha)/(s - d_\alpha)$. Thus $u \in \dot{M}^{s,\, q}(\mathcal{X}_\alpha)$. In particular, taking $q = 2/s$ for each $s \in (d_\alpha, \infty)$, we know that $\dot{M}^{s,\, 2/s}(\mathcal{X}_\alpha)$ are nontrivial. Notice that $\dot{M}^{s,\, 2/s}(\mathcal{X}_\alpha) \subset \dot{B}^1_{2,\, 2}(\mathcal{X}_\alpha)$ when $s > 1$. Similarly, when $0 < s < 1$, $\dot{M}^{1,\, 2}(\mathcal{X}_\alpha) \subset \dot{B}^s_{2/s,\, 2/s}(\mathcal{X}_\alpha)$, and moreover, $\dot{B}^s_{2/s,\, 2/s}(\mathcal{X}_\alpha)$ contains the restriction of any function in $\dot{B}^s_{2/s,\, 2/s}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $\mathcal{X}_\alpha$. Then $\dot{B}^s_{2/s,\, 2/s}(\mathcal{X}_\alpha)$ for all $s \in (0, \infty)$ are nontrivial. This finishes the proof of Theorem 4.3. $\square$

Remark 4.2. In the proof of Theorem 4.3, we actually proved that $\dot{M}^{s,\,q}(\mathcal{X}_\alpha)$ are nontrivial for $s \in (1,\,\infty)$ and

$$0 < q < \frac{2 - d_\alpha}{s - d_\alpha}.$$

But $(2 - d_\alpha)/(s - d_\alpha)$ is not critical by Theorem 4.2. So it would be interesting to know whether $\dot{M}^{s,\,q}(\mathcal{X}_\alpha)$ is trivial or not for $s \in (1,\,\infty)$ and

$$\frac{2 - d_\alpha}{s - d_\alpha} \le q \le \frac{2(2 - d_\alpha)}{2s - (s+1)d_\alpha} \equiv \frac{2\frac{2-d_\alpha}{1-d_\alpha}}{2 + (s-1)\frac{2-d_\alpha}{1-d_\alpha}},$$

where the last index is critical by Theorem 4.2.

Acknowledgement. We would like to thank Eero Saksman and Tomás Soto for an argument that allowed us to handle all values of q for $\dot{N}^1_{p,\,q}(\mathcal{X})$ in Theorem 4.1.

References

[1] M. Bourdon and H. Pajot, Cohomologie l_p et espaces de Besov, J. Reine Angew. Math. 558 (2003), 85-108.

[2] A. P. Calderón, Estimates for singular integral operators in terms of maximal functions, Studia Math. 44 (1972), 563-582.

[3] M. Christ, The extension problem for certain function spaces involving fractional orders of differentiability, Ark. Mat. 22 (1984), 63-81.

[4] R. A. DeVore and R. C. Sharpley, Maximal functions measuring smoothness, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 47 (1984), no. 293, 1-115.

[5] N. Fujii, A condition for a two-weight norm inequality for singular integral operators, Studia Math. 98 (1991), 175-190.

[6] A. E. Gatto, Product rule and chain rule estimates for fractional derivatives on spaces that satisfy the doubling condition, J. Funct. Anal. 188 (2002), 27-37.

[7] A. Gogatishvili, P. Koskela and N. Shanmugalingam, Interpolation properties of Besov spaces defined on metric spaces, Math. Nachr. 283 (2010), 215-231.

[8] L. Grafakos, L. Liu and D. Yang, Vector-valued singular integrals and maximal functions on spaces of homogeneous type, Math. Scand. 104 (2009), 296-310.

[9] Y. Han, D. Müller and D. Yang, A theory of Besov and Triebel-Lizorkin spaces on metric measure spaces modeled on Carnot-Carathéodory spaces, Abstr. Appl. Anal. 2008, Art. ID 893409, 250 pp.

[10] J. Heinonen, Lectures on Analysis on Metric Spaces, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.

[11] J. Heinonen and P. Koskela, Quasiconformal maps in metric spaces with controlled geometry, Acta Math. 181 (1998), 1-61.

[12] P. Hajłasz, Sobolev spaces on an arbitrary metric spaces, Potential Anal. 5 (1996), 403-415.

[13] P. Hajłasz, Sobolev spaces on metric-measure spaces, heat kernels and analysis on manifolds, graphs, and metric spaces (Paris, 2002), 173-218, Contemp. Math., 338, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2004.

[14] T. Heikkinen, P. Koskela and H. Tuominen, Sobolev-type spaces from generalized Poincaré inequalities, Studia Math. 181 (2007), 1-16.

[15] S. Keith and X. Zhong, The Poincaré inequality is an open ended condition, Ann. of Math. (2) 167 (2008), 575-599.

[16] P. Koskela and E. Saksman, Pointwise characterizations of Hardy-Sobolev functions, Math. Res. Lett. 15 (2008), 727-744.

[17] P. Koskela and P. MacManus, Quasiconformal mappings and Sobolev spaces, Studia Math. 131 (1998), 1-17.

[18] P. Koskela, D. Yang and Y. Zhou, A characterization of Hajłasz-Sobolev and Triebel-Lizorkin spaces via grand Littlewood-Paley functions, J. Funct. Anal. 258 (2010), 2637-2661.

[19] P. Koskela, D. Yang and Y. Zhou, Pointwise characterizations of Besov and Triebel-Lizorkin spaces and quasiconformal mappings, Adv. Math. 226 (2010), 3579-3621.

[20] A. Miyachi, Hardy-Sobolev spaces and maximal functions, J. Math. Soc. Japan 42 (1990), 73-90.

[21] D. Müller and D. Yang, A difference characterization of Besov and Triebel-Lizorkin spaces on RD-spaces, Forum Math. 21 (2009), 259-298.

[22] J. Peetre, New Thoughts on Besov Spaces, Duke University Mathematics Series, No. 1. Mathematics Department, Duke University, Durham, N. C., 1976.

[23] N. Shanmugalingam, Newtonian spaces: an extension of Sobolev spaces to metric measure spaces, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana 16 (2000), 243-279.

[24] P. Shvartsman, On extensions of Sobolev functions defined on regular subsets of metric measure spaces, J. Approx. Theory 144 (2007), 139-161.

[25] H. Triebel, Theory of Function Spaces, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1983.

[26] H. Triebel, Theory of Function Spaces. II, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1992.

[27] D. Yang, New characterizations of Hajłasz-Sobolev spaces on metric spaces, Sci. China Ser. A 46 (2003), 675-689.

[28] D. Yang and Y. Zhou, New properties of Besov and Triebel-Lizorkin spaces on RD-spaces, manuscripta math. 134 (2011), 59-90.

Amiran Gogatishvili

Institute of Mathematics, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Žitná 25, 115 67 Prague 1, Czech Republic

E-mail address: `gogatish@math.cas.cz`

Pekka Koskela

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, P. O. Box 35 (MaD), FI-40014, University of Jyväskylä, Finland

E-mail address: `pkoskela@maths.jyu.fi`

Yuan Zhou

Department of Mathematics, Beijing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Beijing 100083, P. R. China
and
Department of Mathematics and Statistics, P. O. Box 35 (MaD), FI-40014, University of Jyväskylä, Finland

E-mail address: `yuan.y.zhou@jyu.fi`